


BX

8630


.B433g

Supp.









orig

Supplement to Gospel Problems



I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or be afraid of doing so.—Brigham Young, Journal of Discourses, Vol. 1, page 364.

Price, 50 cents, postpaid

Gospel Problems, 35c postpaid

Brigham Young
University Library

George H. Brimhall

Collection on Religion

Mrs. P. S. Dargatz

From

Call No. 211 Acc. No. 71393

Could anything that might occur to you, or that might take place in the Church, or with her officers or authorities, change your faith in the purposes, and in the absolute justice and mercy, of the Lord, or in the saving power of his gospel, the message of his salvation? If so, your faith is not deep-rooted, and there is strong need of your becoming convinced. * * (Gospel Doc., page 79.)

INTRODUCTION

71393

The Saints are never safe in following the protests and counsels of those who would have us ever and always in harmony with the world. We have our particular mission to perform; and that we may perform it in consonance with divine purposes, we are running counter to the ways of man. We are made unpopular. The contempt of the world is on us, and we are the unloved child among the peoples of the earth.

"Having Done All Stand." There are people who are courageous in doing all they can to bring about certain results. They will combat evils and resist the wrongs that are inflicted upon them and upon others; but when they have been defeated, when they see a just cause suffer, and evilly disposed men triumphant, they give up. What is the use? That is the question uppermost in their minds. They see wicked men apparently successful. They see men of evil repute honored by their fellow men until they are almost persuaded that fate has her rewards for wrong doing. With them, what appears to be a lost cause inspires no hope. It is lost, they say, and we shall have to make the best of it, and let it go. They are at heart discouraged. Some almost question the purposes of Providence. They have the courage of men who are brave at heart, but they have not the courage of faith.

How different it was with Paul! He had labored fearlessly, he had delivered a divine message, he had resisted the enemy, and they apparently triumphed over him. He was taken prisoner and subjected to humiliating treatment by the administrators of the law. He was in bonds, and death awaited him, but he was still courageous. His was the courage of faith. Read these stirring words of his sent to the Ephesians, recorded in Ephesians 6:13, sent when most men would have thought their cause lost: "Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand."

After we have done all we could do for the cause of truth, and withstood the evil that men have brought upon us, and we have been overwhelmed by their

wrongs, it is still our duty to stand. We cannot give up; we must not lie down. Great causes are not won in a single generation. To stand firm in the face of overwhelming opposition, when you have done all you can, is the courage of faith. The courage of faith is the courage of progress. Men who possess that divine quality go on; they are not permitted to stand still if they would. They are not simply the creatures of their own power and wisdom; they are instrumentalities of a higher law and a divine purpose.

Others would quit, they would avoid trouble. When it comes, it is to them most unfortunate. It is really too bad. In their minds it might have been avoided. They want to square themselves with the world. The decree of the world has gone forth, why withstand it? "We have withstood evil," they say, "and it has overwhelmed us. Why stand longer?" Such men read history, if at all, only as they make it; they cannot see the hand of God in the affairs of men, because they see only with the eye of man and not with the eye of faith. All resistance is gone out of them—they have left God out of the question. They have not put on his whole armor. Without it they are loaded down with fear and apprehension, and they sink. To such men everything that brings trouble seems unnecessary. As Saints of God, it is our duty "to stand," even when we are overwhelmed by evil.

"And I give unto you a commandment, that ye shall forsake all evil and cleave unto all good, that ye shall live by every word which proceedeth forth out of the mouth of God;

"For he will give unto the faithful, line upon line, precept upon precept; and I will try you and prove you herewith;

"And whoso layeth down his life in my cause, for my name's sake, shall find it again, even life eternal;

"Therefore be not afraid of your enemies, for I have decreed in my heart, saith the Lord, that I will prove you in all things, whether you will abide in my covenant, even unto death, that you may be found worthy;

"For if ye will not abide in my covenant, ye are not worthy of me."—Jos. F. Smith, Gospel Doc., page 146-8.

SUPPLEMENT TO GOSPEL PROBLEMS

Freedom and reason make us men.
Take this away, and what are we then?
Mere animals, and just as well
The beasts may think of heaven or hell.

"Gospel Problems" has been out for several months and has drawn some fire, but "it never touched it," there is not so much as the smell of fire upon it. It stands like the rock of Gibraltar and needs no defense—this is only a supplement.

Some of our friends say, "O, it is scriptural and reasonable enough, and truthful, but is out of harmony with the living oracles and therefore must be wrong." We answer, "If it is in harmony with the scriptures, the law and the prophets, truth and reason, who is to blame for its lack of harmony with the living oracles?" But, it is objected, what is the use of a head if you do not follow it? We answer, "What is the use of a neck if it is too stiff to turn the head? What is the use of a heart if it cannot soften and mellow a cold philosophical brain? Can one part of the body say to the other members of the body, 'We have no need of thee.' Rather, are all the members of the body necessary?"—Paul. Others protest, what is the use of leaders and praying for them if we are not going to sustain them? Does that mean we must uphold them in everything, right or wrong, as

though they were infallible? Is it inconsistent for us to vote and pray for them even though we differ with them? Should not Republicans pray for Democratic Presidents, and vice versa, a Democrat pray for a Republican President? These objections are so weak and purile that they tend to strengthen Gospel Problems rather than weaken them. It is further objected that "there is not one constructive idea in the book." We respond, "It does not claim to be a new revelation, direction or dictation of a new program for the church. If so it would be open to criticism as usurping the prerogative of the President of the church. The presumption would be that God had not revealed sufficient to the prophet Joseph Smith and other Presidents, but that some lay member must introduce something new. Gospel Problems do not aspire to anything new. "There is nothing new under the sun."—Solomon. It only presumes to defend, and contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints," and uphold the doctrine of Adam-God as taught by Brigham Young, revealed through Joseph Smith and the prophet Daniel; the correct and literal translation of the Book of Mormon by the gift and power of the Holy Ghost. It is a defense of the constructive idea of the United Order, given to the Saints through the prophet Joseph Smith "for their temporal and spiritual salvation" in contrast with the present financial systems of Zion, which tend to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, the very antipodes of each other. It is a defense of the constructive idea of the revelation to Joseph Smith on plural marriage, providing for the temporal and spiritual salvation of the millions of widows and mateless maidens that mourn "because of the inhumanity of man to man." It is a protest against the laws of man in direct opposition to the laws of God as revealed in the Doctrine and Covenants, Book of Mormon and the Bible. We maintain that these principles are all **constructive** and opposition to them is **destruction**—destructive of faith in God and the principles of eternal truth and righteousness as recorded in the holy scriptures. Declarations against these principles are being applauded in our great tabernacle. One of the imported speakers in the late Educational Convention said that private ownership of property was the very basis of civilization, and that any

abrogation of it was anarchy—the doctrine of the Reds, and the penalty deportation; and he was applauded to the echo. And yet God has said “And let not any man among you say that it is his own, for it should not be called his, nor any part of it.” (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 104-70). And again, “It is not meet that one man should possess that which is above another; therefore the world lieth in sin.” The Superintendent of Public Instruction declared in the tabernacle that the French was the most idealistic nation on the earth,” and was most vociferously applauded. Surely the Lord must cut His work short in righteousness or there will be no flesh saved. Can we wonder that the Lord **wondered** “if He should find faith in the earth at His coming.”

It is a voice of warning against patterning after Paris and Wall Street and Babylon. The Lord has said this “is the day of warning” when “every man should warn his neighbor.” The preface section of the Doctrine and Covenants is so relevant we cannot refrain from quoting:

14. And the arm of the Lord shall be revealed; and the day cometh that they who will not hear the voice of the Lord, neither the voice of his servants, neither give heed to the words of the prophets and apostles, shall be cut off from among the people;

15. For they have strayed from mine ordinances, and have broken mine everlasting covenant;

16. They seek not the Lord to establish his righteousness, but every man walketh in his own way, and after the image of his own God, whose image is in the likeness of the world, and whose substance is that of an idol, which waxeth old and shall perish in Babylon, even Babylon the great, which shall fall.

17. Wherefore I the Lord, knowing the calamity which should come upon the inhabitants of the earth, called upon my servant Joseph Smith, jun., and spake unto him from heaven, and gave him commandments;

18. And also gave commandments to others, that they should proclaim these things unto the world; and all this that it might be fulfilled, which was written by the prophets;

19. The weak things of the world shall come forth and break down the mighty and strong ones, that man

should not counsel his fellow man, neither trust in the arm of flesh,

20. But that every man might speak in the name of God the Lord, even the Saviour of the world;

21. That faith also might increase in the earth;

22. That mine everlasting covenant might be established;

Search the Scriptures.—Jesus Christ.

Some of our friends object to the interpretation and application of the drunkards of Ephraim and the covenant with death and hell as recorded in the 28th chapter of Isaiah. They say, "I shouldn't think you would want to belong to a church led by drunkards and making a covenant with **death** and **hell**, or complain of being excommunicated from such a church. We admit that the appellation of drunkards seems rather severe, and a covenant with death and hell harsh, but it is Isaiah who makes them, not the author, and when you come to think they are not so harsh nor inapplicable after all for we surely are drunken with worldliness and an inordinate determination to harmonize with Babylon at any cost of principle; and when we renounce plural marriage and pronounce it dead and buried, and at the same time sustain and uphold those living in it and still retain the revelation revealing it in our scriptures (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 132) we ought to accept of the plea of **drunkards** for our otherwise inexplicable conduct.

Now as to the propriety of the term "death and hell" we must admit that opposition to a revelation from heaven might consistently be designated as the opposite, "**hell**" as Satan is the opposite to Christ, and we understand that the penalty of opposition to the revelations of heaven is banishment to hell, which is the second death. "O, how great the goodness of our God, who prepareth a way for our escape from the grasp of that awful monster, yea that monster **death** and **hell** which I call the

death of the body and also the **death** of the spirit." (II Nephi: 9-10).

"And now I, Nephi, write more of the words of Isaiah for my soul **delighteth** in his words." (II Nephi 11-2) and he quotes Isaiah 4, beginning, "and in that day shall seven women take hold of one man saying, "We will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel only let us be called in thy name to take away our reproach." He further says, "For because the words of Isaiah are not plain unto you, nevertheless they are plain **unto all those who are filled with the spirit of prophecy.**" (II Nephi, 25:4).

"Nevertheless in the days that the prophecies of Isaiah **shall be fulfilled, men shall know** of a surety at the time when they shall come to pass." (Verse 7.) That is, a man will know when seven women take hold of him, and when the drunkards of Ephraim interfere, making this agreement with death and hell.

Now Jesus says, "**Ye ought to search these things, yea a commandment I give unto you that ye search these things diligently**, for great are the words of Isaiah." (III Nephi 23:1) Now when we comply with this commandment of Jesus and search Isaiah diligently, and try to understand his prophecies as best we can, we are criticised and even excommunicated. We all agree on the application of the 29th chapter of Isaiah as applying to modern Israel and the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, and a division of the subject into two chapters is **man's** doings. If we are mistaken in the application of the 28th chapter, it is but reasonable and consistent that the leaders of Ephraim make the proper application of this important scripture and publish the same, that this mooted question may be settled, authoritatively, and put an end to speculations on it. We are all **commanded to search Isaiah diligently** and we are remiss in our duty if we do not do it.

True, we are all more or less responsible for this government agreement with death and hell, either by vote or silent acquiescence, which is construed as accessory to the crime; but we have been so drilled in the school of unity and harmony that there is danger of our forgetting that there must need be opposition in all things;

danger of sinking into a neutral, passive, listless condition of "innocuous desuetude." A denatured, mushy harmony. The fame of our unanimous voting in the tabernacle is almost as world wide as the famous harmony of our great organ and choir. Unanimity has become such a habit with us that an opposition vote seems almost sacrilege. It is the only accounting for the unanimous vote sustaining Ex-President Taft in his position on the "League of Nations." Such a vote could not be obtained in any other public hall in the world. Truly "our union is known through creation and we've always been faithful and true." But our union with Babylon, like the half hour silence in heaven, is becoming ominous and portentous. President Smith repeatedly testified that he had received no revelation from heaven during his administration, and in the tabernacle, not long since, denied most emphatically the rumor, or imputation that he had had a vision or revelation. If one thousand years is one day with the Lord a half hour would be twenty years and ten months. This one hundred years, one generation, is complete next May, since the prophet Joseph received his first vision, after which we may expect things to begin to happen in accordance with the statement of Moroni, that in this generation should then things be fulfilled.

B. YOUNG'S STATEMENT ON ADAM GOD.

It seems strange that people will believe that "as man now is, God once was, and that as God now is, man may be;" that "God is an exalted man" and still repudiate the doctrine of Adam-God. These incredulous people believe that Elohim, Jehovah and Michael (Adam) the "father of all living," created the world and yet cannot believe He is the God of this world. It seems presumptuous indeed for them to ever aspire to be the God of anything, if Adam cannot be the God of the world he created and peopled. If a man is not to become the God of his own posterity what will he be the God of? Evidently if God the Father of Jesus Christ was once a man like ourselves, he had a father as we have, a God to pray to, and that God in turn, was once a man also, and so on ad infinitum, without beginning or end. As Brigham Young says "there never was a time when men were not passing

through this ordeal and preparation to become Gods." Joseph Smith says, "Wherever was there a father without first being a Son?" Jehovah means son, and is used interchangeably as the son, and a son. In the dedicatory prayer of the Kirtland Temple the prophet Joseph repeatedly applies the name Jehovah to the Father whom he is addressing, as any one may see by careful perusal of the prayer as recorded in the Doctrine and Covenants, Sec. 109. Elohim may signify the Father or Grandfather or Great-Grandfather—God, or the council of the Gods, and Jehovah may be applied to any of them in the capacity or relationship of a son, as they all are, for "where was there ever a father without first being a son." Joseph Smith in Church History, Vol. 6, p. 476. Adam is in line with his progenitors, the Gods, and by the geneological records cannot be deposed from his position as the God of this world under the council and direction of the Gods above him, "intelligences one above another without end." (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 78). The whole superstructure for a plurality of the Gods is based upon this doctrine of Adam-God, and must stand or fall together.

These plates have been revealed by the power of God, and they have been translated by the power of God. The translation of them which you have seen is correct and I command you to bear record of what you now see and hear.—
Jesus Christ, Church History, Vol. 1, page 55.

Since publishing the article on the literal translation of the Book of Mormon, and hearing further objections to it, we see no reason to change our positions, modify the statements, or make any additional defense. Truth is mighty and will prevail. We might emphasize our defense on the grammar question. If the Lord is particular about grammar why did he not inspire Peter and James to speak grammatically in their defense before the court, charged with healing the cripple at the Gate Beautiful on the Sabbath Day? Surely the inspiration necessary to work this great miracle would be sufficient to

cause them to speak grammatically if the Lord cared much for grammar.

Inasmuch as the officers could see by their language that they were "ignorant and unclean men" they doubtless had used ungrammatical language in commanding the cripple to arise and walk. We are splitting hairs when we seek to make a distinction between these men speaking by the power of the Holy Ghost and Joseph Smith translating the Book of Mormon in the manner described by witnesses to the authenticity of the Book of Mormon. It is creating a distinction without a difference. Besides grammar is constantly changing. The grammar of today is not the grammar of tomorrow. Grammarians of today even do not agree on all the rules, and some say that either of two rules may be correct. They are in constant transition. Chaucer, the father of English literature, is scarcely intelligible today. Scholarship must have been exceedingly rare among the Nephites as it was the world over in that age, and consequently the writers would not likely be skilled grammarians. Of course the grammar of different languages is so fundamentally dissimilar that a literal translation would not necessarily carry the grammatical errors with it; but any translation that rendered an illiterate composition in classical English would hardly be called a fair translation, especially if the Lord intended that the "imperfections" of the original should be retained in the translation, as he evidently did, or He would not have answered Moroni that "fools shall mock, but they shall mourn." The Lord doubtless wanted the translation so that the proud and learned would have some pretext for mocking and scoffing, but that "my grace shall be sufficient to the meek that they shall **take no advantage of your weakness.**" If the Lord is so anxious to conform to the formalities of the times, He would have had His son born in a palace and cradled in a Sedan, instead of being born in a stable and cradled in a manger. The circumstances were no accident.

If we are going to insist the Lord dress His language according to our rules, next we will insist that He appear in a dress suit to conform to the fashions of the times. Moroni appeared to the prophet Joseph in a loose robe, neither hat, gloves nor shoes. The dress is immaterial—

the message everything. The important thing is to have the language in such form that the poor and unlearned understand, and the rich and learned be humbled to accept it.

Let us take just one passage to illustrate. "And it came to pass that by thus exercising the law upon them every man suffered according to that which he had done; they **became more still**, and durst not commit any wickedness if it were known. Therefore there was much peace among the people of Nephi until the fifth year of the reign of the judges. (Alma I:33).

Now any child can understand this passage, but most any child might improve the construction. It don't sound like Joseph Smith's language. If he had been free to use his own language he would probably have written more like this: "By strict enforcement of the law, wickedness was restrained and peace maintained until the fifth year of the reign of the judges."

If the Lord had wanted this in better form He would doubtless have had it translated by Professor Anthon, or Washington Irving, who was in the zenith of his fame at that time, and a nearby resident of New York, but Irving was busy with his Knickerbocker History of New York—a very different work from the Book of Mormon.

It seems to have been Martin Harris and David Whitmore who testified as to the manner of translating the Book of Mormon, instead of Oliver and David, as stated in "Gospel Problems." But that only makes the case the stronger, for Oliver Cowdery virtually gives the same evidence in a different form. He speaks of the joy to sit and write day after day as the words fall from the lips of the prophet Joseph. That does not sound as if Joseph was studying it out in his mind. There is a tradition that Oliver said Joseph was so unlearned that he often had to spell the big words to Oliver, as he doubtless had to spell most of the proper names, or how would Oliver know how to spell them, and how would even Joseph know except he saw them in print. "And we beheld the sea which we called Irreantum," which being interpreted is "Many Waters." How could he think that out? If Joseph was not using the plates and the interpre-

ters, why have a curtain between him and the scribe? He did not do so in writing the Doctrine and Covenants.

Some people will allow that the Lord must have given the names, dates, numbers, etc. to the translator in plain English, but that he was under the necessity of thinking out the other parts and supplying the language. But this does not obviate the difficulty; the conundrum still obtrudes. How could he think out the incidents of history, the dialogues, and preaching of the various characters of the book? How could he get the incidents of the journey to Jerusalem, after the brass plates, except they were given to him in plain English? The beating of Nephi with a rod by his older brethern might be shown in pantomime, or a moving picture, but the dialogue between the brothers, nor the words of the angel to them could not be so given, except by writing between acts and that too in simple plain English to the understanding of the untutored young translator, and why would not that same English be good enough to go into the book for our understanding? Most of the converts to the gospel, like the translator, are poor and uneducated. The sermons of King Moshiah and Benjamin must have been given to him in plain English, as all of the preachings and teachings, blessings of the leaders even to Jesus himself. And why should the translator scramble it to unscramble it again. Why should a type setter "pi" his own type just for the fun of setting it again? Is the Lord thus wasteful of the energies of his servants? Is it reasonable to suppose the Lord would require all this extra work and worry of the youthful, unlearned translator, just to see him sweat and puzzle? Roberts puts the reading theory as a **premium** on laziness. We would put the theory of thinking it out in his own mind a needless waste of energy. Would it not be sufficient tax to sit and read all day and spell proper names and the big words to a long hand scribe, especially to a young farmer unaccustomed to sedentary habits or literary work?

And all these unreasonable explanations that don't explain, and impossible things that can't be done, just to stop the unbelieving Gentiles from mocking at the words of the Book of Mormon. And will it stop them and make them believe? We fancy it may divert their

mocking of the Book of Mormon to mocking the absurd and impossible explanations of its "imperfections," but the aggregate mocking will be increased rather than diminished.

But why should we be so solicitous about this mocking? The Lord says. "Fools shall mock, but they shall mourn," and why not let it go at that? If we are going to pacify all the mockers, the task is too great, the Lord will not impose it on us; we are not responsible for their mocking and scoffing. They mocked at Brigham Young, Adam-God, and we seek to mollify and pacify them by telling them that is not the doctrine of the church, but only the doctrine of Brigham Young. But we are "making matters worse, for next we will have to explain it was only an idea of Joseph Smith, and the prophet Daniel, and of Jesus Christ, for Jesus gave this revelation to Joseph Smith.

"Adam-ondi-Ahman, because, said he, it is the place where Adam shall come to visit his people, or the Ancient of days **shall sit**, as spoken of by Daniel, the prophet." (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 116-1.)

Now let us turn to Daniel, and see what he says about the Adam-God doctrine. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garments were white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. 10. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set, and the books were opened." (Daniel, Chap. 7-9-10.)

The above revelation of Joseph Smith, together with the prophecy of Daniel seem to corroborate Brigham Young's doctrine of Adam-God—beyond question.

The Gentiles mock at plural marriage, also. Next thing in order will be to explain, as the Josephites do, that this also is just a doctrine of Brigham Young.

Now in Lehi's vision of the iron rod, he saw large and spacious buildings filled with worldly pleasure seekers, mocking and pointing the finger of scorn at those who were clinging to the iron rod, the word of God—and walking in the strait and narrow path, leading to the

tree of life. But Lehi says: "We heeded them not." He did not try to pacify them with specious explanations and obsequious policy.

If Joseph Smith were just thinking out the Book of Mormon in his own language, would he be likely to give one of Lehi's sons the name of "Sam," when his own brother was named Samuel, and Sam generally regarded as a nick name? This name can only be accounted for on the statement that Joseph read it from the parchment and would not disappear until properly written. If the Lord had cared to have the Book of Mormon come forth in good form he could just as well have done so as to have the language of the angel Moroni to Joseph Smith appear in good language. Evidently the angel Moroni was not schooled in English, in fact John the Baptist, Moses and Elias, Peter, James and John, delivered their messages to the prophet in English by the gift and power of the Holy Ghost; whether recorded in their exact language, verbatim, or formulated in the direct language of Joseph, or indirect through Oliver Cowdery, it should not differ materially from the diction of the Book of Mormon, except as the Lord wanted it to differ. The language of these heavenly messengers, as recorded in all our church publications is far superior to the language of the Book of Mormon, although coming through the same instrumentality of the gift and power of the Holy Ghost. And why? Except that God **wanted** the Book of Mormon in such form that the ungodly Gentiles might mock, if they were so disposed, and only the humble receive it. "God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform," and it is futile and irrelevant, and irreverent for us to match our wisdom against His, with specious explanations and worldly philosophy. The imperfections of the Book of Mormon were designedly transmitted into English, and it is not within our province to eliminate or apologize for them, but let the fools mock, for they shall mourn.

"For the natural man is an enemy to God, and has been from the fall of Adam, and will be for ever and ever; but if he yields to the enticings of the Holy Spirit, and putteth off the natural man, and becometh a saint, through the atonement of Christ the Lord, and becometh as a child, submissive, meek, humble, patient, full of love willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him, even as a child doth submit to his father." (Mosiah 3: 19)

Now, this is one of the best pieces of scripture ever written or transmitted, and yet both its truthfulness and grammatical construction is questioned. Critics say it is not true, that "man is a natural enemy to God," and refer to the innocence of little children as a proof. But the innocence of little children is only passive and owing to their ignorance, and not to any disposition to shrink from sin. It is as natural for children to steal, and lie, and quarrel as for the sparks to fly upwards. Each one wants the "biggest piece of pie," and the largest apple. When Lincoln was going down the street with a bawling boy in each hand, and was asked what was the matter, he replied; "Just what's the matter with all the world, three walnuts and two boys." It is human nature the world over, and it's what is the matter with the troubled world today; natural man is a natural enemy to God.

Now, as to the grammar. It will be observed the sentence is incomplete. There is no predicate. But can anyone believe it is the fault of the translator? Is it not self-evident that this passage was correctly translated, just as the original writer wrote it: that the Nephite writer did not notice that his sentence was incomplete; so enwrapt was he in the strength and beauty of the truth and comparison.

But the error does not militate against this scripture. It will hardly be noticed by saints absorbed by the lesson in its beauty and power; but unbelieving critics will mock at it; and they will just as surely "mourn."

But while we are on this piece of scripture, let's get a little more out of it. It says: "willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him." The Lord saw fit to afflict Job, not because of his sins or unworthiness, but the very opposite. If Job had been

a natural man, devoid of the Holy Spirit, he would have rebelled and cursed God and died. When Abraham was tried, he too, would have rebelled and been disobedient, if he had acted the part of the natural man. As it is these trials of their faith will be the brightest jewels in their crowns of eternal life. They will never cease to thank God, they were accounted worthy of such a trial of their faith.

As Abraham and Isaac were ascending the mountain to make the sacrifice, Isaac constantly harrowed his father's heart strings by asking about the offering. His father kept responding, "God will provide the ram, my son," but secretly praying to God to reveal the secret to Isaac, and give him a willing and obedient spirit that he might not resist. Imagine his emotion and relief when Isaac faced him and said, "Father, don't deceive me; I am the ram." And when he saw the truth in his father's agitated countenance, he said; "Don't grieve, father, for I thank God I am accounted worthy to be the ram." And when his father was binding him he said, "See that the cords are strong, father, so that they will not break, should I struggle under the pain of the knife, for though the spirit is willing the flesh is weak." Had Isaac not known and consented to the sacrifice, the symbol of Christ's offering on the cross would not have been complete; both sons knew and consented, according to the Book of Jasper. But we are digressing. However, the point is that both Jesus and Isaac were "willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him," and shared in the trial of faith with their fathers and will share in the glory. We may often be tried, even by members of our own families, as Joseph was by his brethern selling him into slavery, and Nephi's persecution by his older brothers, and yet, by the Holy Spirit, see the hand of the Lord in the trial of our faith, and the glory of all concerned. To please God, we must acknowledge His hand in all things, and He will eventually overrule them for our good.

Opponents to Gospel Problems affirm that the full and correct translation of the Book of Mormon as there

defined is predicated upon the testimony of apostates—the witnesses to the divinity of the book. Strange that credible as a man may be, so soon as he disagrees with the church authorities he is henceforth discreditable. What object do these apostates have in relating this manner of translating? What proof is there that they told a different story before they left the church, or that they told a different story **after** they came back into the Church? Oliver Cowdery was a brother-in-law to David Whitmore and very intimate with him, and doubtless would have corrected his statement as to the manner of translating if he disagreed with them. Martin Harris came back into the Church and died in the faith, and yet is not known to have changed his testimony regarding the translation.

The prophet's mother, in her history of her son Joseph says that on one occasion when he looked into the Urim and Thummim instead of the words of Book of Mormon, there appeared a commandment to write David Whitmore to come to Harmony at once and move them to his home in Fayette. But these objectors say, "What could his mother know about it?" Just as though she would not be likely to know more about it than we do, when she was in constant communication with her son. Strange that this manner of translating the Book of Mormon should never be questioned until all these witnesses were dead, and then we presume to know more about it than they did, and denounce them as apostates and liars. They say these witnesses are discreditable because they say that Joseph put the seer-stone in a hat while translating, while they think it should be put directly over, or on the characters to be translated. It must indeed be a very literal verbatim translation if this was necessary. Can any Latter-day saint believe that God could not translate the characters with a hat intervening. The story of Martin Harris substituting a common stone for the seer-stone as a test is generally accredited as being true, and yet Joseph is credited with saying, "What is the matter Martin? All is dark as Egypt." This sounds like the hat story was true. This stone is reputed to have been found in a well that the prophet was digging to earn money for a chest in which to keep the

records, and his mother says he brought the plates to the house wrapped in his coat. If they were not too sacred to be wrapped in a coat, why should the stone be too sacred to be in a hat, or Jesus too holy to be cradled in a manger? But it is protested if the stone would translate through a hat it would translate through earth, and so the plates might as well have remained safely in the stone box in the Hill Cumorah. Certainly the Lord could have given us the Book of Mormon without any plates whatever if He saw fit, and in perfect English, too, if He had so desired; but he just wanted plain simple English so the poor and unlearned could read and understand, and the rich and learned be humbled or otherwise mock. He wanted Joseph to have the trouble, and experience and responsibility of caring for them while the wicked tried to get them from him, and there might be witnesses to the existence and correct translation of the plates. The eight witnesses are important, and strengthening, and we notice the common colloquial word "hefted" as used in their testimony "mocked" at by the learned Gentiles as being anything but classical. But what does the Lord care for their mocking? The word is fitting, and perfectly understood by everybody. The Lord might have required us to believe and accept the Book of Mormon without any witnesses, but let us be thankful He has made it so easy with the aid of these witnesses. It is creditably reported that Joseph carried the Urim and Thummim with him, and would occasionally use it to see that the plates were safe though they were miles distant. Oliver Cowdery also writes that with this translating instrument, he saw David Whitmore at every stopping place on the road, and went out to meet him in the evening; so surely the instrument could translate through a hat.

If the stone would reveal the safety of the plates miles away, and the whereabouts of David Whitmore, traveling on the road fifty or a hundred miles away it would surely translate writing that intervened. Next we will question how Moroni got into Joseph's bedroom, or how Peter got out of jail with the doors locked and barred, and the guard standing before the door.

We trust the reader will excuse the seeming waste

of time and space here occupied, but when proponents resort to these puerile objections we must descend to the same level to meet them.

In his *New Witness for God*, Bro. Roberts sees a serious criticism of the Book of Mormon by its opponents in the absence of any names among the Aborigines of America corresponding to the Book of Mormon name. They argue that if the Book of Mormon is true the tribal nomenclature of the Indians would show in the root and branch of their origin, and Bro. Roberts regretfully acknowledges the paucity of the tracings and faintness of the echo to those names. But we submit, if there were a plain resemblance these same critics would jump at it as an evidence against the genuineness of the Book and insinuate the author had cunningly or bunglingly adopted names to deceive the unwary, and it surely is true that any author of fiction with a modicum of mental acumen would adopt such names. So it makes no difference in either case. They would find fault just the same. It seems to be a case of "you will and you won't, you shall and you shan't," you'll be damned if you do, and be damned if you don't." We appreciate the patience and pains of Bro. Roberts in answering these criticisms, but when we think of the waste of time and talent, we are reminded of the Irishman's apology for his table spread. "Plenty of it, such as it is; and good enough, what there is of it."

It would have been easy, and natural for Joseph Smith to have adopted names showing relationship to the Chieftain and tribal names of the American Indian if he were writing a fiction, or an imposition; but as it was he wrote, or spoke, or spelled to the scribe the names without question that appeared on the parchment, or reflected in the Urim and Thummim, and is an evidence in favor of the divinity of the Book of Mormon rather than against it; evidence not only of its divine origin, but evidence of its divine translation, for if the translator were thinking out the translation he doubtless would have, human like, thought out, or invented, names showing relationship to Indian names.

It is a waste of time to argue with these carping critics. The best answer yet formulated is the one from the Lord, short and sharp. "Fools shall mock, but they

shall mourn. But My grace shall be sufficient unto the meek that they shall not take advantage of your weaknesses." He further says: "I give weaknesses to men that they might be humble," but these mockers imagine their weakness is strength, and it augments their pride rather than their humility. If they would surely repent and ask God in the name of Jesus Christ if these things are true, He would show them by the power of the Holy Ghost that they are true, and they would then find joy and pleasure in reading the Book of Mormon.

"The language is Joseph Smiths; the errors in style and grammar are due to his very limited education, for which the lack of educational opportunities are responsible. To relieve himself somewhat of the mental strain in the work of translation when he came to matter transcribed from the Hebrew prophets into the Nephite record, or to instructions of the Messiah that paralleled his teachings to the people of Judea—of which their already existed a reasonably good English translation—the Prophet adopted that translation." (Roberts N. W. for God, page 512.)

We do not believe the Prophet would assume this responsibility, and especially to change the wording of that translation. He had had too many lessons in strict obedience to venture such a liberty with this sacred work. He would not do it unless so commanded of the Lord. And the Lord would not likely so command him, unless he too wished "to relieve himself somewhat of the mental strain" of translating for the Prophet. Why the Lord saw fit to translate this bible scripture almost verbatim we do not know. But any way he saw fit to do it, unbelievers would criticise so what's the use of trying to reconcile them? Let them mock and mourn. John came neither eating nor drinking and he had a devil; Christ came both eating and drinking and he was a glutton and wine bibbler. Strange if God could not, or would not, use the same language to the Nephites as to the Jews, but that this language must be attributed to Joseph Smith.

"The thought, however, and the ideas, he obtained by concentrated mental effort aided by the Urim Thummin, and the inspiration of God; but the language in

which the translation was thought out was in such words and forms of expression as Joseph Smith could use and this mental translation in language was doubtless reflected in the Urim Thummim where it remained until written by the scribe. And now as the Prophet was uneducated at the time of translating the Nephite record, the language of his translation was in the faulty English of one circumscribed as he was, and of the period and place when and where the translation took place. This I regard as a complete answer to all the objections that can be urged upon the score of the Book of Mormon's faulty English, and it is the only answer that can be successfully made to it." (Roberts New Witness for God, page 497.)

Now if this truly is the only answer that can be successfully given then the Lord's answer to Moroni that fools mock, but they shall mourn, when he feared that the Gentiles would mock at our words, because of their awkwardness in placing their words, was not successful. We beg to differ and suggest it is the most successful answer ever given or ever will be given.

We respectfully ask what difference can there be between the Urim Thummim producing or reflecting the faulty English of Joseph Smith and rendering the faulty language of Moroni into faulty English? Is not this making a distinction without a difference? Is not God equally responsible in either case? And, further, if the Gentile mocking was to be at Joseph Smith's language instead of Moroni's, why did not the Lord so explain to Moroni? The presumption seems to be that had the Urim Thummim translated the faulty language of Moroni direct into English his "imperfections" would or should disappear and his ideas re-appear in perfect English, but this perfection is lost through re-appearing in Joseph Smith's language. Now we ask why could not, and why would not the Urim Thummim correct Joseph's faulty language as to correct Moroni's faulty language? In either case God is made responsible, and mocking Joseph Smith's language is just as bad as mocking Moroni's, and either is mocking God, for which they will mourn; so let them mock.

But our proponents will protest, "what about the changes made by Joseph and Oliver themselves in the

2nd and 3rd editions of 1837 and 1840?" Well doubtless most of those changes were merely typographical and the others were unimportant, and were just permitted, to gratify a harmless pedagogical pride in grammar. The matter was not so vital as permitting the gratification of Martin Harris' curiosity and dubiety with the 116 pages of manuscript.

But if the Lord did not cut His work short in righteousness there is no telling what questionable changes might be made to the Book of Mormon in the future under the license of this new theory of its translation. In time it would probably no more resemble the original copy than the modern belle resembles her pioneer mother.

Let no man break the laws of the land, for he that keepeth the laws of God had no need to break the laws of the land.—Doc. & Cov., Sec. 58:21.

"We also bear testimony that Brigham Young is the prophet of the living God, and that he has the revelations of Jesus Christ; that he has guided his people by the power of revelation from the time he became their leader until the present, and he has never failed in his duty or mission. He has been faithful before God, and faithful to this people. We bear this testimony to the world. We fear not, neither do we heed their scorn, contempt, sneers. We are used to it." Joseph F. Smith, Gospel Doc., page 101.)

4. And now, verily I say unto you concerning the laws of the land, it is my will that my people should observe to do all things whatsoever I command them;
5. And that law of the land which is constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges belong to all mankind and is justifiable before me;
6. Therefore, I, The Lord, justify you, and your brethren of my church, in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land;

7. And as pertaining to law of man, whatsoever, is more or less than these, cometh of evil.
8. I, the Lord God, make you free, therefore ye are free indeed; and the law also maketh you free;
9. Nevertheless, when the wicked rule, the people mourn." (Gospel Doctrine p. 5 10-11.)

"We are told here that no man need break the laws of the land who will keep the laws of God. But this is further defined by the passage which I read afterwards—the law of the land, which all have no need to break, is that law which is the **constitutional** law of the land, and that is as God himself has defined it. And whatsoever is more or less than this cometh of evil. Now, it seems to me that this makes the matter so clear that it is not possible for any man who professes to be a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to make any mistake, or to be in doubt as to the course he should pursue under the command of God in relation to the observance of the laws of the land. I maintain that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has ever been faithful to the **constitutional** laws of our country. I maintain, also, that I have a right to this opinion, as an American citizen, as one who was not only born on American soil, but who descended from parents who for generations were born in America. I have a right to interpret the law in this manner, and to form my own conclusions and express my opinions thereon, regardless of the opinion of other men.

I ask myself, What law have you broken? What constitutional law have you not observed? I am bound not only by allegiance to the government of the United States, but by the actual command of God Almighty, to observe and obey every constitutional law of the land, and without hesitancy I declare to this congregation that I have never violated, nor transgressed any law, because I have endeavored, from my youth up, to be a law-abiding citizen, and not only so, but to be a peace-maker, a preacher of righteousness, and not only to preach righteousness by word, but by example. What, therefore, have I to fear? The Lord Almighty requires this people to observe the laws of the land, to be subject to "the power that be," so far as they abide by the fun-

damental principles of good government, but he will hold them responsible if they will pass unconstitutional measures and frame unjust and proscriptive laws, as did Nebuchadnezzar and Darrius, in relation to the three Hebrew children and Daniel. **If lawmakers have a mind to violate their oath, break their covenants and their faith with the people, and depart from the provisions of the constitution, where is the law, human or divine, which binds me, as an individual, to outwardly and openly proclaim my acceptance of their acts? * * ***

I wish to enter here my avowal that the people called Latter-day Saints, as has been often repeated from this stand, are the most law-abiding, the most peaceable, long-suffering and patient people that can today be found within the confines of this republic, and perhaps anywhere else upon the face of the earth; **and we intend to continue to be law-abiding so far as the constitutional law of the land is concerned; and we expect to meet the consequence of our obedience to the laws and commandments of God, like men. These are my sentiments briefly expressed, upon this subject.**—Gospel Doctrine, pages 510-11.

We maintain with President Smith that this law against plural marriage does “interfere with that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges belonging to all mankind,” and therefore is not justifiable before the Lord.

The first commandment was to multiply and replenish the earth. Thousands of men refuse to marry and obey this law, which they have a right to under the law of free agency, but they have no right to act the dog in the manger and deny their natural partners from fulfilling the law of God, and marrying some one else, even though that man may have another wife. If all three are agreed nobody's rights are violated, but a law against it does violate “rights and privileges that should belong to all mankind.” Men go to war and kill each other by the millions. Seven and one-half million in the late war which means seven and one-half million widows and mateless maidens who are deprived of fulfilling the law of God and nature by this unjust law of man. The Lord says, (Isaiah 4th Chap.), that these seven million women

shall take hold of one million men and say, "We will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us be called in thy name to take away our reproach." But men have made a law to prevent this and bring reproach upon these women instead of taking reproach away, and we join hands with them. Let's read what Brigham Young said about it:

"There never was that necessity, there never has been a time on the face of the earth from the time the Church went to destruction and the priesthood was taken from the earth that the powers of darkness and the powers of earth and hell were so embittered and enraged and incensed against God and godliness on the earth as they are at the present time, and when the spirit of persecution and the spirit of hatred, of wrath and malice ceases in the world against this people it will be the time that this people have **apostatized and joined hands with the wicked and not until then.**" (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 4, page 327.)

And now what the Lord says: "And I give unto you a commandment, that ye shall forsake all evil and cleave unto all good that ye shall live by **every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God;**

"For He will give unto the faithful line upon line, precept upon precept; and I will **try you and prove you** herewith;

"And whoso **layeth down his life in my cause, for my name's sake, shall find it again, even life eternal.**

"Therefore, be **not afraid of your enemies,** for I have decreed in my heart, saith the Lord, that I will **prove you** in all things, whether you will **abide in my covenant even unto death, that you may be found worthy.**

For if ye will not abide in my covenant, ye are not **worthy of me.**"

But, some will insist, your position may be scriptural and reasonable and logical, but it is out of harmony with the presidency of the church, the living oracles, so you must be off and on the road to apostacy. Are we to ignore the scriptures and reason and our own convictions to be in harmony with our leaders? Is there no possibility of their being mistaken? Are they infallible? Besides, what virtue or satisfaction can there be in the salvation

by blind obedience, following some one else's convictions in direct opposition to your own. What is our own intelligence given to us for if we are not to be guided by it, but by some one else's? Is not this putting our trust in the arm of flesh, and does not Nephi say, "Cursed is the man who putteth his trust in man, or maketh flesh his arm, or harkeneth unto the precepts of men, except those precepts are given by the power of the Holy Ghost?" and if given by the power of the Holy Ghost will they be in conflict with the scriptures, in conflict with the dead oracles?

Here is the word of a dead oracle, Brigham Young: "We read in the Bible that there is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars. In the Book of Doctrine and Covenants these glories are called the telestial, terestial and celestial which is the highest. There are worlds, different departments or mansions in our father's house. Now those men or those women who know no more about the powers of God and the influences of the Holy Spirit than to be led entirely by another person, suspending their own understanding and pinning their faith upon another's sleeve, will never be capable of entering into the celestial glory to be crowned as they anticipate. They never will be capable of becoming Gods. They cannot rule themselves to say nothing of ruling others, but they must be dictated to in every trifle like a child. They cannot control themselves in the least but **James**, or **Peter**, or somebody else must control them. They never can become Gods or be counted as rulers with glory, immortality and eternal life. They never can hold scepters of glory, majesty and power in the celestial kingdom. Who will? Those who are valiant and inspired with the true independence of heaven, who will go forth boldly in the service of their God, **leaving others to do as they please, determined to do right, though all mankind besides should take the opposite course.** Will this apply to any of you? Your own hearts can answer." (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 1, page 312.)

This statement is so reasonable and scriptural and conclusive that it ought to suffice, but we cannot refrain from asking why, if the Lord has such supreme confidence in the immutability and infallibility of the law of

the land—why He did not insist on Daniel, the prophet, keeping the law of the land, and also his three Hebrew brethren? Why did he not inspire Peter and James to submit to the order of the court, instead of answering as they did. “Whether it is better to obey man or God, judge ye?” Why did hundreds of our brethren go to prison? Why did he not have President John Taylor and Wilford Woodruff obey the laws of the land instead of going on the underground so many years? Why does He promise us that we “shall have no law but His law at My coming, for I will be your law-giver.” (Sec. 38). If the present law of the land is perfect this promise can be no solace to us—in fact make no difference to us.

If all God’s people had always been as loyal to the law of the land as we claim to be there never would have been any martyrs, imprisonments or persecutions. Think of what the Saints might have saved themselves.

“University of Hard Knocks.”

“The man who has daily inured himself to habits of concentrated attention, energetic will and self-denial in unnecessary things will stand like a tower when everything rocks around him. (Wm. Jones).

The above authorship is worthy of a more classical name, but truth is no respecter of persons or names. It is one of God’s truths that an immovable, unshakable character is founded on the “university of hard knocks.” Seldom indeed do men rise to eminence without graduating voluntarily or involuntarily through this school. Lincoln was born and bred in it. But in later life he never shirked nor evaded it when he might have done so. He milked his own cow and tended his horse up to the presidency; and he stood “like a tower when everything rocked around him.” In his early manhood he concentrated his mind upon such great problems as prohibition, abolition, woman suffrage, etc., in advance of his times and forced

himself to stand for these principles in the face of a stonewall opposition and unpopularity.

Washington was born to the manor of wealth and ease, but he ignored his birth-right as the tempter's snare and forced himself into the hardships and dangers of wilderness life—exploring and surveying. Had he accepted the ease and luxury that offered he never would have developed those qualities of body and mind necessary to fill his destination, the Father of his country. Had Abraham remained in the lap of his luxurious and idolatrous parental home he never would have become "Father of the Faithful." The tented wilderness life, and temptations of Mt. Horeb afforded the necessary schooling.

It was no accident that Jesus was born in a stable, cradled in a manger and apprenticed to a carpenter,—it was the deliberate choice of both the Father and the Son. "The foxes have their holes and the birds have their nests, but the Son of Man hath no where to lay His head," was a part of the program for his success.

Theodore Roosevelt was born and cradled in wealth and ease but he broke loose from these restraining and enervating entanglements and forced himself to the hard knocks of ranch life in the wilderness. He rode wild horses in the mountains, cooked his own frugal meals about the open campfire, and made his bed on the pine boughs. He wrangled herds of wild cattle all day and stood his turn at night-herding. And while he forced himself unnecessarily to these tasks and hardships, he concentrated his mind upon the great problems of the age and stood, "like a tower when everything rocked around him. He stood first for peace, and first for war, first for capital and first for labor, first for rugged honesty and first for keen diplomacy. He was impervious to the shafts of either blame or praise. He hesitated not to beard the British lion in his den, rebuking him in his London speech for his mis-rule in Egypt and denounced the race suicide of the Parisians in Paris, the citadel of sterility by affirming a "wilfully barren woman as bad as a lazy man." He stood for principle, like the rock of Gibraltar, while everything rocked around him."

Jacob was being spoiled by his doting mother, but

the Lord came to his rescue, and drove him into exile as a refugee. He in turn was spoiling his favorite son Joseph, but he was God's favorite also, and he had him sold into slavery and graduated from prison for his life's work.

Moses was educated and pampered in his youth, but he broke away from their restraining influences and lost himself in the desert to tend sheep for his father-in-law, that he might be schooled in the university of adversity, for his mission.

Daniel might have revelled and luxuriated on the delicacies of the king's table, but he knew this was not the road to great and efficient service; so he begged for plain food and hard knocks. Had he accepted the easy path, we never would have been blessed with the visions, foretelling the history of the world, the overthrow of its kingdoms and the establishment of the Kingdom of God.

Had Paul continued in the easy life of a scholar and philosopher, we would never have been favored with the numerous epistles of Paul to the Saints.

It is not in the Providence nor economy of the Universe that men should develop into masterful service in the paths of ease and luxury. David was great as a shepherd boy—great as a refugee, but became weak and flabby under the seductive influence of ease and luxury. In his adversity he was truly, "a man after God's own heart;" but in his zenith of wealth and luxury he was a prodigal son. When he recovered the spoils from the robber Amalekites and his associates declined to share with their brethren who were fatigued and obliged to remain behind, he rebuked them with stern indignation that they should decline dividing the spoils with their less fortunate brethren. In his triumphant prosperity he forgot his God and his loyalty to his friend and neighbor Uriah the Hittite; but in his adversity he displayed a loyalty and humility towards one of the house of Saul almost without a parallel. When this man Shemei cast dirt and dust at David and cursed and reviled him as a bloody man, and one of David's men asked permission to cut off his head for abusing the King, David said "No, let him curse. It may be the Lord hath commanded him to curse David, and it may be the Lord will have compassion

on me and requite me good for his cursing." David could hardly have been susceptible of such noble sentiments except under adverse circumstances. Hear the melting tones of his overflowing heart when he cried in the anguish of his soul, "Oh my son Absalom, my son, my son! Could I but have died for thee, my son! my son!

When we are misused and abused by our friends, instead of retaliating with evil for evil, we should remember this suggestion of David that perchance God has commanded them to abuse us, or rather allowed it, to chasten and humble us, and that peradventure if we bear it patiently or return good for evil, God's sympathy may be enlisted in our favor, and might requite us good for the evil done to us.

A parent observing one child bearing patiently the wrongs of another without retaliating, will naturally be enlisted sympathetically with the unresisting child. If we, in spite of the frailties of human nature are susceptible to such influences, how much more can we trust to God in His perfection. Can we not leave judgment to Him? Whatever comes to us, can we not allow, "as three thousand years ago, that his judgments are just and righteous altogether." (Lincoln Second Inaugural.)

The mobbings of Missouri and Illinois and hardships of the emigration trail, together with the privations and toils of pioneer life was not without a Divine object. We see the results in the masterful leadership and strong rank and file of God's people of destiny.

The ease and seducing influence of free passes, free rides, free dinners, feather beds and downy coverings along the paths of flowery ease is enervating and alienating. Under its lullaby, we are pacified and lulled away into carnal security, that we will say, "All is well in Zion; yea Zion prospers, all is well." (2 Nephi 28-2.)

Under its stultifying and benumbing power, or lack of power, we are not developed to the capacity of our inherent powers. To attain to our highest powers of physical and spiritual life we must deny ourselves the full indulgence of ease and luxury and compel ourselves at times to do difficult and unpleasant tasks. Pulling hard against the stream develops masterful power. Coasting with the tide along the lines of least resistance induces

flabbiness of body and mind, a concomitant of luxurious ease.

The prophet Joseph Smith was born and cradled in poverty. At one time his father came nearly being enriched, but was cheated out of it by a dishonest partner. We would not have had it so but had him blessed with riches, that he might educate the young Prophet and have plenty of means with which to publish the Book of Mormon, without having to borrow it from Martin Harris. Then Martin would never have begged for the 116 pages of the manuscript, and they would not have been stolen, and the books of Nephi and Jacob substituted for them, and Martin would not have gone to the "learned" man in New York to have him say "I cannot read a sealed book," and the Lord reply, "The learned shall not read them, therefore I will proceed to do mine own work, for the wisdom of the wise shall perish." Then the Book of Mormon would have been in classical English and there would have been no "imperfections," for the Gentiles to mock about, and saved Bro. Roberts writing so much in explanation of their imperfections. But the Lord moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform.

There is no better evidence of the danger of an easy, luxuriant life than that of Solomon. No man ever made a better start in the strait and narrow path; but he neglected to train and discipline himself in self-denial. He would not pull against the stream, but drifted with it along the lines of least resistance, down the path of ease and self-indulgence, and the youthful glory of Solomon withered and faded to inglorious defeat.

Moses led the children of Israel out in the wilderness to school them in the same university of hard knocks that he himself had trained in for forty years, but they murmured and complained and longed for the flesh pots of Egypt; their mouths watered when they thought of the leeks and melons and nice things of Egypt. In response to their inordinate cravings the Lord sent them quail, but they ate so greedily and thanklessly the Lord cursed them, and they died by thousands while the flesh, or fowl, was between their teeth. They were so greedy and self-indulgent and impatient of hardships that the

Lord decreed they should wander in the wilderness for forty years, and none of them, except Joshua and Caleb, should enter the goodly land.

The Lehi colony gives us the same lesson. Nephi endured hunger and thirst and fatigue and persecution by his brethren without murmur or complaint, but Laman and Lemuel murmured and complained and wanted to return to their luxurious home and wealth in Jerusalem; said their father was a fool to leave his riches and voluntarily subject his family to the hardships of the wilderness; that their women had better died before they left Jerusalem. But the Lord seems to plan such trials for His people. The breaking of Nephi's bow was no accident with the Lord. Doubtless, he designed it as a trial of their faith, and Nephi was the only one of the colony who did not murmur against the Lord. "Behind a frowning providence he hides a smiling face." The Lord chastises and disciplines those He loves, but many less spiritual minded onlookers do not see the hand of the Lord and they attribute the fiery ordeals of their brethren to the displeasure of the Lord.

Job's comforters(?) laid all his troubles to the curse of God upon him for his unrighteousness. The misfortunes were sure proof to them of his unrighteousness. No doubt the Jews attributed Christ's poverty to his unworthiness and disregard for their laws and rules of conduct. They called Him a Sabbath-breaker and a wine bibbler and a consort of publicans and sinners.

Many of the prosperous saints of today are pointing to their less prosperous brothers as law breakers under the curse of God and man and refer to their financial reverses as sure evidence. Their hearts are so much set upon the things of this world and they aspire to the honors of men that they fail to learn the lessons of the holy scriptures. Some even pay their tithing as a speculation, because they are promised full barns and bursting granaries by so doing. Their faith is founded on temporal blessings that might become a curse. Nephi's misfortune in breaking his bow was no evidence of God's displeasure any more than was Job's trouble or Jesus Christ's poverty. The riches of faith, hope and charity are incomparable with fine houses, fine autos, lands and

bank accounts. Hardships and reversals and adversity are often blessings in disguise, especially for those inclined to shirk and avoid them, seeking the paths of ease and luxury and popularity. In Lehi's vision of the Iron Rod, the word of God, he saw a large and spacious building, filled with worldly people having a fine time, pointing the finger of shame at those walking in the strait and narrow path and clinging to the iron rod. Lehi saw that in consequence of this mocking and jeering of worldly people that some became ashamed and wandered from the path and lost their way, joining hands with those who were mocking and pointing the finger of shame; but Lehi says, "we heeded them not" but clung to the rod which led to the Tree of Life.

And Zeezrom said again unto him, "Is the Son of God, the very eternal Father? And Amulek said unto him, Yea he is the very eternal Father of heaven and earth and all things which in them is, he is the beginning and the end, the first and the last."—Alma 11:38, 39.

We believe many do not properly interpret or understand the mission and relationship of the Father and the Son in the mission of glory and redemption of the world. The Sectarian world confuse them into one identical personage, inseparable, while we go to the other extreme of magnifying the Son even to the dwarfing of the Father. Evidently the Father gave full honor to the Son, creating the world by and through Him and commanding us to pray to Him—the Father—in the name of the Son. But the Son was equally zealous in giving all honor and glory to the Father, a beautiful example of love and deference to each other. With Jesus it was always "Thus sayeth the Father," "thus commandeth the Father," and "Father, Thy will be done and not mine," etc.

While we condemn the Sectarians for combining the Father and Son as one, they insist our Book of Mormon teaches this doctrine plainer than their bible. Abinadi says: "I would that ye should understand that God Him-

self will come down among the children of men and shall redeem his people; and because he dwelleth in flesh he shall be called the Son of God, and having subjected the flesh to the will of the Father, being the Father and the Son—the Father because he was conceived by the power of God, and the Son because of the flesh, thus becoming the Father and Son; and they are one God, yea, the very eternal father of heaven and earth.” (Mosiah 15:1, 4.) And again he says: “Teach them that redemption cometh through Christ the Lord who is the very eternal father.” (16 Ch., 15.)

When God appeared to the brother of Jared and he saw his finger, he said: “I did not know the Lord had flesh and blood;” the Lord did not correct him, but said, “I am the Father and the Son.” Ether 3rd Ch., 14.) And again, in 4th Ch. and 12th verse, he said: “For behold, I am the Father.” It was the Father with a body of flesh and bones doing this work for and in behalf of the Son. Every Father is both the Father and the Son in a sense, especially until the son is born and may legitimately officiate and make provisions for that son. True, he says, “this is the body of my spirit.” He could say the same thing after his resurrection when his disciples thought they saw a spirit. If the body of flesh and bones is not the body of the spirit, what is it the body of? Is not our own body of flesh and blood the body of our spirit?

It was no doubt the father officiating for the son in the case of the Lord eating calf with Abraham as the Son. Jesus proved to his doubting disciples after his resurrection that He was not a spirit, but a real tangible resurrected being, by eating fish and honeycomb. If this eating is proof in one case, it should be in the other.

The Lord has said: A bishop should be the husband of at least one wife that he might have the necessary experience in governing his own home before assuming to govern other households. In the revelation to John Taylor he also intimates that those not obeying his law of plural marriage were not qualified to preside over those who had obeyed the higher law. Likewise the Lord seems to realize that spirits not yet tabernacled in the flesh are not qualified by experience to officiate for those in advance of them, and we are inclined to think

he would not deviate from this law or rule, even in the case of His son Jesus, for "He is no respecter of persons" and we are all his sons and daughters.

In 3rd Nephi it appears very plain, the Lord Jesus Christ answered Nephi and said: "This night shall the sign be given and tomorrow I come into the world;" that is, tomorrow I come into the world **through my Son**. "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God * * * and the **Word** was made **flesh** and **dwelt among us**." (St. John, 1-14.) Agreeing with Abinadi that "God himself will come down among the children of men and because He dwelleth in the flesh he shall be called the Son of God." If this was not the Father officiating for the Son, then the body of the child in the womb of the virgin Mary was dead and should have been still-born. Everybody must know that the spirit is in the body months before birth, as has been abundantly demonstrated.

We have no record of pre-existent spirits administering to men in the flesh before they have gone through the experience themselves. They would not be qualified to do so. They would be administering to those in advance of themselves. Joseph Smith says: The angel Gabriel visiting Daniel was Noah, and the one administering to John the Revelator forbid John to worship him, saying, "I am thy fellow-servant and of the prophets, worship God." That is, he had been in the flesh; perhaps was then in the flesh, a resurrected being, as was the angel Moroni, and all the heavenly messengers to Joseph Smith. Some people try to reconcile these scriptures with the idea that Jesus like Adam had a body before He came here in the flesh, but this theory would seem to sustain the doctrine of trans-migration of soul. We are inclined to the theory of the Father officiating in the flesh for and in behalf of his Son as a more plausible solution of the problem.

"God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophet hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the world." (Heb. 7:12.)

Now it is difficult for us to state more plainly than Paul has here stated, that formerly God the Father spoke to us through such prophets as the brother of Jared, (Moriantemar) Abraham, Nephi and others, but since the birth of Christ He has spoken to us through His Son. But it may be questioned what of the expression "By whom also He made the worlds." He made the world by and in the name of His Son, just as Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedek for and in behalf of his grandson Levi.

"And as I may so say Levi also received tithes, paid tithes in Abraham for he was yet in the loins of his father when Melchisedek met him." (Hebrew 7:9.)

Now if Abraham could pay tithes for and in behalf of his grandson Levi before he was born, surely God the Father could create worlds for and in behalf of His Son Jesus Christ before He was born, and otherwise officiate for and in His behalf, as He evidently did in touching the stones with his fingers to give light for the Jaredites, and in eating calf with Abraham.

Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and your children and to all that are far off even as many as the Lord your God shall call.— Acts 2:38, 39.

Another doctrine upon which we seem to be drifting is that of the nature and limitations of the Holy Ghost. Bro. Roberts writes apologetically that he himself was led into error by the writings of the early elders of the church, and he proceeds to quote and change the writings of Parley P. Pratt, as recorded in the Voice of Warning and the Key to Theology. Now these writings were submitted to and approved by the prophet Joseph Smith and have been accepted and approved by the Latter-Day Saints until we got the spirit of change. We repudiated Brigham Young's Adam-God doctrine, rejected the full and correct translation of the Book of Mormon. We pro-

nounced plural marriage dead and buried, "stopped short never to go again;" (but the old man is not dead yet.) The **Ancient of Days** will sit and the books will be open and the judgment set, as the prophet Daniel said. (7th Ch., 10 Verse.) But not satisfied with all these changes, we proceed to change the early doctrine of the church on the nature and powers of the Holy Ghost and substitute the word "influence" for "Holy Ghost."

Now we understand the Holy Ghost is a personage of spirit and is one of the Godhead and a necessary part by which God is enabled to be everywhere present at the same time, but Roberts intimates that he—the Holy Ghost—being a personage, is circumscribed by the same limitations as the Father and the Son. If so the Holy Ghost cannot be at two places at the same time. Then the Holy Ghost could not have been with the Twelve and the Saints on this hemisphere while it was with the Twelve and the Saints on the Day of Pentecost on the Eastern hemisphere. It could not be here with the Saints now and at the same time with the Saints in Europe and upon the isles of the sea. If the Holy Ghost is circumscribed by the limitations of the Father and Son, he could be with but one person at a time. When John the Baptist "was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb," no one else could be in possession of the Holy Ghost. We read that seven men appointed to look after the poor and the widows, with Stephen at their head, were all "filled with the Holy Ghost"—that is, each one of them separately. The Holy Ghost seemed to have been with thousands on the Day of Pentecost and stood on them as cloven tongues of fire and enabled every man to understand in his own tongue. That was the influence of the Holy Ghost, but the Holy Ghost himself was there also, otherwise there would have been no influence there. The noted philosopher and theologian, Orson Pratt says a substance cannot act where it is not present, that even the law of gravitation would be inoperative if matter was not connected and governed of God; that left to itself would be as likely to repel as to attract, and that all would be chaos but for the governing power of the spirit of God controlling the universe according to fixed law.

But when we substitute influence for the Holy Ghost, we substitute **nothing**, for influence is nothing but an attribute of matter. It is no more a substance than is love, or anger, or faith. It has neither body, parts nor passions. It is immaterial like the sectarian God.

Shall we say, "receive ye the influence of the Holy Ghost"? Will **influence** lead us into all truth and show us things to come? Will **influence** heal the sick and raise the dead or stand like cloven tongues of fire, or assume the form of a dove, or a man, as in the case of Nephi's messenger on the high mountain? Can the **influence** of this government feed the Lamanites without communication with them in a material way, or protect its citizens abroad except with its long, strong arm?

It seems to us that the part of our Godhead, known as the Holy Ghost, is sufficiently attenuated, refined and elusive without reducing it to a mere attribute, a sort of hypnotic clairvoyance, eliminating all substantial reality. Joseph Smith said that spirit was matter, only more refined and elusive than the grosser matter with which we are familiar. How strange and lamentably lame would our scriptures seem, and weakened by eliminating the name **Holy Ghost** and substituting the word **influence**! Next thing in order and consistency will be to reduce the other two-thirds of the Godhead to an **influence** or attribute, and then our God will be homogeneous and like the sectarian God "without body, parts or passions," for **influence** is not even a passion.

It may be protested that the Holy Ghost cannot be a personage of spirit and be in more than one place at the same time. We answer, "He can if he is big enough" or to change the form of the same truth, the Holy Ghost knows but one place—the Universe. The Father and the Son are evidently circumscribed in the limitations of their personality to about six feet, but the third person of the God-head must have greater power of expansion in reach, elasticity or diffusion in order to be all-powerful and everywhere present.

We may speak of the Son as He, old Sol, and yet he is capable of reaching out to the whole universe, or at least the solar system, all at the same time, but we do not reduce his rays of heat and light to a mere attribute, or influence. Heat and light is a material thing, and a

part and parcel of the sun, transmitted to us on the waves of ether, diffused throughout space. Even the sun can have no influence where it is not present. He does nothing for us by night except as he is reflected by the moon and stars.

Now the material composition of the Holy Ghost is doubtless the most subtle, refined and intelligent matter or mind, of the universe. It cannot be obstructed by intervening objects, as the grosser rays of the sun, and thus make shadows, because it is endowed with the attributes of intelligence, necessary to function as a part of the God-head. Of course it is a mystery to us because we are inferior, and naturally subordinate to it, as the governing power of the Universe, and in our ignorance we hardly know whether to speak of this personage as mind or matter. At best we can only hope to see in part and know in part, see through a glass darkly. When asked "what is matter" we can but shake our heads and respond "never mind," and when asked "What is mind?" "Well, no matter." And reverently bow our heads in humble acknowledgment of dependence to Supreme power, the Giver and Dispenser of every good. But even the influence of energy, kenetic or potential, either in the form of light, heat or power cannot be transmitted to us independent of matter.

**"Great be the Glory of
those who do right;
Who overcome evil, in good
take delight."**

Opponents to the United Order object to its principles as unjust, and that all are not equal in their mental and physical ability to earn money, and therefore not entitled to its equal distribution and enjoyment. They argue that each individual is entitled to wealth in proportion to their physical and mental ability to accumulate. Now at first blush this position looks impregnable, but when we come to focus the light of truth and reason on it, we will blush for shame to defend such a heartless

proposition. We did not create ourselves, neither bodies nor mind. We are indebted to Providence for the excellence of our bodies and mind. We are not self-creative. True we are partly responsible for the care and development of our physical and mental beings, but only partly. The foundation is a gift to us, even the disposition and ability to properly care for our bodies and build on that foundation is more or less a gift from God, or our parents, and if we seek to dodge the question by claiming it through our parentage, we are begging the question and but shifting the origin of the gift a little further back. It was a gift to them, no matter how far we trace it back. True there may be some shadow of merit in the exercise of the will power in resisting temptations of excesses and intemperance, but even that **will power** may be more or less a gift. Now we are not advocating predestination, but the line between predestination and fore-ordination is so fine that we are but just able to distinguish the difference. There is a difference, however, or God would be unjust in holding us responsible. We have **some** inherent powers of will that can be exercised or turned loose to drift, and for which we can justly be held responsible. Otherwise salvation and damnation would be a myth and a mockery; but the tracing thread of this line of responsibility is so delicate and intricate that God only is able to judge; hence the Lord would not trust even Peter to keep the gate, for as the Book of Mormon says:

"But behold the way of man is narrow, but it lieth in a straight course before him, and the keeper of the gate is the Holy One of Israel and he **employeth no servant** there, and there is no other way save it be by the gate, for **he cannot be deceived**, for the Lord God is His name. (11 Nephi, 9:41.)

The difference in our physical and mental makeup is very difficult of solution. It is no doubt partly predicated upon our pre-existent spiritual life, but not altogether. The body has something to do with it. The spirit must be more or less handicapped by the body, the quality of machine it works through; but there is a great dissimilarity even in the bodies of full brothers and sisters. Darwin gives a very reasonable explanation of this difference on the theory that the blood, and conse-

quently seed, of our progenitors is not thoroughly and completely mixed within us, and therefore some children happen to resemble one grandparent and some another. Some black-headed and some red-headed, some block heads and some strong heads, both in limb and brain; that is, we may inherit the good qualities of some good ancestor or the bad qualities of some bad ancestral parent and grandparent. Like oil and water, the seed is not thoroughly mixed and there is no certainty which parent we will resemble. We are at the mercy of chance, or luck. There is no known law by which this can be regulated by either parent or child or scientist. Darwin himself cannot tell us, and in this acknowledgment he virtually concedes there is a higher power than himself. For if man were the highest intelligence, he would never run into a mystery. He would know it all as we do our alphabet from A to Z. We know our alphabet because we made it, but we did not make ourselves, so we do not know ourselves, and our origin and whole being is a mystery that our Maker only knows. Therefore, He alone is able to judge us.

But when we say the physical, mental, temporal and spiritual condition of our brother or sister—and we are all brothers and sisters—is their own fault, we make ourselves the judge, a prerogative that belongs to God only, the Maker—the only one capable of judging a righteous judgment. Again the Book of Mormon comes to our assistance:

“And ye will not suffer your children, that they go hungry, or naked; neither will ye suffer that they transgress the laws of God, and fight and quarrel one with another, and serve the devil who is the master of sin, or who is the evil spirit which hath been spoken of by our fathers; he being an enemy to all righteousness;

But ye will teach them to walk in the ways of truth, and soberness; we will teach them to love one another, and to serve one another;

And also, ye yourselves will succor those that stand in need of your succor; ye will administer of your substance unto him that standeth in need; and ye will not suffer that the beggar putteth up his petition to you in vain, and turn him out to perish.

Perhaps thou shalt say, the man has brought upon himself his misery, therefore I will stay my hand, and will not give unto him my food, nor impart unto him of my substance that he may not suffer, for his punishments are just.

But I say unto you, O man, whosoever doeth this, the same hath great cause to repent; and except he repenteth of that which he hath done, he perisheth for ever, and hath no interest in the Kingdom of God.

For behold, are we not all beggars? Do we not all depend upon the same Being, even God, for all the substance which we have; for both food and raiment, and for gold, and silver, and for all the riches which we have of every kind?

And behold, even at this time, ye have been calling on His name, and begging for a remission of your sins. And has He suffered that ye have begged in vain? Nay; He has poured out His Spirit upon you, and has caused that your hearts should be filled with joy, and has caused that your mouths should be stopped, that ye could not find utterance, so exceeding great was your joy." (Moses 4, 14-20 inclusive.)

Now, it is hard to understand how the world can justify the present system of finance, but still more difficult to understand the attitude of Latter-Day Saints. Of course, we have our Fast offerings, our Relief Societies and tithing, but still we limp along very imperfectly and the poor sufferer and the lame and the blind, the widow and the orphan are very imperfectly cared for, and we talk about the "Lord's poor" and "the Devil's poor" and "the poor devils," and forget the lessons of the Lost Sheep and the Prodigal Son. We try to sear our conscience over and fortify ourselves against the United Order by the imperfect law of tithing, only given to us as the law of Moses was to ancient Israel, as a schoolmaster to educate us to the higher law of the gospel—the law of consecration. The law of tithing exacts necessity and comforts from the poor but only the "superfluities they don't need." (Lincoln's definition of wealth) from the rich.

It does not obviate the disparity and distinctions of wealth and poverty. In spite of it the rich grow richer and the poor poorer. The ideal under the United—God's

Order—is that there shall be no rich and no poor, but all live in common, loving each other as ourselves. “Every man seeking the interests of his neighbor.” (Doc. and Cov.)

In an ideal family, there is no distinction of wealth or even comfort between either parents or children, or between brother and sister. We do not neglect the blind nor the lame, nor those weak in body or mind, but to the contrary we give them the best we have. We so sympathize with them that we would exchange places with them for a while if we could. If we could but take it turn about, we would gladly do so, and then we could better sympathize with each other. How often we hear a loving mother, or brother or sister say, “Of, if I could only bear the pain and suffering a little while for you, and if we could, how reluctant would we be to turn it back to them. Now, how would we like to exchange places permanently with the unfortunate, especially if we knew they would complain of supporting us? Would we not prefer to retain our superior God-given powers of body and mind and support the less fortunate than to exchange places with them? They may not be to blame for their condition, and we may not arrogate to ourselves all the credit for our superior condition. Then why should not these unfortunates become a community charge. When we all strive to bear each other’s burdens, the weight is hardly perceptible. It will hardly balance against the joy of helping. Do we not as parents desire to treat our children alike? To see them equal, living in common. Would we think of consigning some to the cellar or to the garret, especially the unfortunate, and the more talented to the parlor and the dining room? Don’t we try to perpetuate that equality in our will, and would we not regret and be pained to think the more fortunate, the stronger, after our departure, will take advantage of the weaker ones and by any means reduce them to poverty, while they themselves luxuriate in the “superfluity of things they don’t need”? If we, being evil, can feel this way, how much more so does our Father in heaven feel over His children here in the flesh.

Enoch observes that the Lord wept, and asked: “Lord, how is it that thou canst weep, seeing thou art

holy and from all eternity to eternity?" And God answered, "Behold these thy brethren, they are the workmanship of mine own hand, and I gave unto them their knowledge in the day that I created them, and in the garden of Eden gave I unto man his agency, and unto thy brethren have I said, and also gave commandment that they should love one another, and that they should choose Me, their Father, but they are without affection and they hate their own blood. * * * Wherefore for this shall the heavens weep, yea, and all the workmanship of Mine hand." No wonder God wept and "Satan looked up and laughed and his angels rejoiced." Misery likes company. So Satan delights in the misery of others. "And again Enoch wept and cried unto the Lord, When shall the earth rest * * And I ask Thee if Thou wilt not come again on the earth. * * And the Lord said unto Enoch, as I live even so will I come in the last days, in the days of wickedness and vengeance to fulfill the oath which I have made unto you concerning the children of Noah." (B. of Moses, 7th Ch., Verses 61, 65, 66.)

61. And the day shall come that the earth shall rest, but before that day the heavens shall be darkened, and a veil of darkness shall cover the earth; and the heavens shall shake, and also the earth; and great tribulations shall be among the children of men, but my people will I preserve;

65. And it came to pass that Enoch saw the day of the coming of the Son of Man, in the last days, to dwell on the earth in righteousness for the space of a thousand years;

66. But before that day he saw great tribulations among the wicked; and he also saw the sea, that it was troubled, and men's hearts failing them, looking forth with fear for the judgments of the Almighty God, which should come upon the wicked.

We have seen the sea that it was troubled in the late war, and we experienced the "overflowing scourge, for a desolating sickness shall cover the land." (Doc. and Cov., Sec. 45:31.) And we have the promise that, notwithstanding the plagues and judgments, "but my people will I preserve," but He will only do it on con-

ditions that we keep His commandments, "For if you do not what I say, ye have no promise." If we live no different than the wicked world that is to be destroyed, we cannot expect to be preserved, for He is "no respecter of persons" and "cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance." (Doc. and Co., preface section.)

And the Lord called His people Zion, because they were one heart and one mind, and dwelt in righteousness and there were no poor among them. P. of G. P., Ch. 7:8.) We are not in this condition today, but divided politically, socially and financially. We are but little different to Babylon that is to fall, and except we repent and reform, we will suffer the same fate with Babylon. If we will not learn obedience any other way, we must learn by the things we suffer. If we pattern after Paris and Wall Street, we must expect to suffer with those wicked places. The Lord has said His church and kingdom should "not be destroyed nor left to other people but stand forever." However, that does not exempt us from responsibility. It means He will not abandon us but will chasten and humble us, so that we will willingly go into the United Order to escape starving mob law, just as we willingly came to these mountains of Ephraim to dwell, because we had to. Mob law drove us here and mob law will drive us to share alike, no rich and no poor, and to love our neighbor as ourselves.

We can discern the signs of the sky, and forecast the weather, but can we not discern the signs of the times? (Math. 16:3.) Do we not see the storm gathering, threatening blackness, and see the vivid flashes of anger in the clashes of labor and capital, the inequalities of rich and poor? The wireless signal is in the air. Let us prepare—look to our lamps. What we need to cry for both night and day is the gift of **faith and repentance**—the love of God and each other.

"Do you suppose this people will ever see the day that they will rest in perfect security, in hope of becoming like other people, nation, state, kingdom or society? **They never will.** Christ and Satan never will be friends. Light and darkness will always remain opposites. Brigham Young, (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 1, p. 92.)

Since childhood we have heard about the buffalo, circling around the cows and calves with their heads facing the predatory droves of hungry wolves, and defending their weaker dependencies. Whether true or not, it is a beautiful story, especially if it carries, and drives the lesson home. Will we as human beings permit the buffalo to outdo us? Hunger and cold is as much of an enemy to be guarded against as these carnivorous animals. Will we permit widows and orphans, the lame and the blind, the sick and helpless to suffer from these predatory invaders, hunger and cold, while we look on with cold indifference? These wild animals, God's cattle—live the United Order; there is no rich and no poor among them. Their troubles are made a common cause and the strong risk their lives to save the weak. Now, will we be outdone and buffaloes by the buffalo?—though in the guise of a Latter-day Saint—pusillanimous sinner! "Doff it, for shame, and hang a calf skin on those recreant limbs."

We will not see a lady or the weak and crippled cut wood or carry water without volunteering aid. We give up our seats in the cars to the weak and aged and infirm, we tender and press the easy chairs upon visitors in our homes. We place the choicest foods we have before our guests, and bivouack our wards in the softest beds. Why don't we extend this same care and love to all mankind, God's children? He who would be master of all must learn to be servant of all. It is the United Order—God's Order—and the only thing that will bring order out of the present chaos.

For each person to refuse to return good for evil until the other person does so is childish. It sounds like "I'll quit if you will"; or "well, he hit me first." If we are one of two servants, and the other is trifling and faithless, if we love the master, we will be all the more faithful to make up for the other's deficiency. If one hand is crippled, the other will willingly do double work to fill the loss. To refuse to do good before the other does is equal to each foot refusing to take a forward step until the other foot advances. If our feet

got into this kind of a dispute, how would we ever advance? Producers refuse to lower the cost of living until wages come down, and wage workers refuse to come down until the cost of living comes down, so there is no alternative but to fall down into chaos—anarchy.

School thy feelings, oh, my brother.

The Lord has commanded us to love Him with all our mind, heart and soul, and also love our neighbors as ourselves. The infidel claims this to be an impossibility, an arbitrary and even impossible commandment. That our loves and hates, like our faith and belief, are unalterably controlled by circumstances and evidences over which we have no control, and that we are no more responsible for them than for the color of our hair. They argue that faith or belief is based on evidence. If the evidence is sufficient, we cannot help but believe, and if the evidence is imperfect or insufficient, we cannot but doubt. Likewise, if the circumstances justify, we cannot help but hate or love accordingly.

Now the all important and absorbing question is: Is this absolutely true? If so, God is unjust and unreasonable in making this command.

We acknowledge there is an element of truth in it, but only an element. Satan invariably mixes his doctrines up with some elements of truth in order to deceive. It is true that evidence and circumstances have some weight, but they are not the whole thing, or juries would never disagree but always be unanimous. They sit and listen to the same evidence. However, it is true that evidence and circumstances should have due weight. "How can we believe except we hear, and how can we hear without a preacher, and how can he preach except he is sent?" But how, we might add, can he believe if he don't want to believe? Our hearts may be "set so much upon the things of the world and the honors of men" that we will not permit the evidences to have due weight in our minds. It may be unpopular to believe in Mormonism and Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon

or the United Order. We may lose friends and worldly goods by accepting such a faith. Accordingly we close our minds and harden our hearts against it. God has given human beings—his children—distinctive powers of mind above the brute beast, by which they have will power and reason and are capable of receiving or rejecting; otherwise He would be unjust in commanding them to believe or love Him. We may not have absolute control, but as Alma says, "If you can have but a desire to believe, and cultivate the seed in your hearts that it may grow and bring forth fruit. If we have a desire to believe and ask God to soften our hearts and quicken our minds, He has promised to hear and answer." "Knock and it shall be opened; ask and ye shall receive."

If we desire to love our neighbor, we will cultivate that feeling by minimizing his faults and pardonably magnifying his virtues. We will exercise the will power of the mind to take the most charitable view of his faults and try the experiment of returning good for evil, blessing for cursing, and note the result. We have known men to go so far humbling themselves as to ask forgiveness when they felt sure the fault was on the other side. Almost invariably it will mellow the neighbor and he will say, "I have need to ask thee forgiveness, and comest thou to me?" If we find this too hard a task with a neighbor, try it on members of your own family—your wife, for instance, and see how quickly she will respond and mellow in love and tears. Exercise the forces of the mind and compel yourself to confess your own faults, and acknowledge the virtues of a wife and observe the love spring from her heart into her face.

It is as natural for us to justify ourselves and condemn others as it is for the sparks to fly upwards or the stream to run down hill, and sure as we turn ourselves loose, down we go. Upon the proper exercise of this God-given power hinges our salvation. It is the distinguishing line between the righteous and the wicked. The one cultivates love and friendship, the other hate and enmity, the former joy and salvation, the latter misery and damnation, the natural consequences of our own thoughts and actions, following the line of human nature. The disposition of men to blaspheme the name

of God is evidence of the natural enmity of the natural man to God, or he would swear by wire, by phone, or by telegraph, or by thunder instead of by God.

As King Benjamin says: "For the natural man is an enemy to God, and has been from the fall of Adam, and will be, for ever and ever; but if he yields to the enticings of the Holy Spirit and putteth off the natural man and becometh a saint through the atonement of Christ the Lord, and becometh as a child, submissive, meek, patient, full of love, willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him, even as a child doth submit to his father." (Mosiah, 3 Ch., V. 19.)

Then, how can we say that God is unjust in predicating salvation upon faith and love? As Alma says, "We become our own judges," we make or unmake ourselves. Love makes home a heaven, and hate transforms it into hell and holds good for the next world as well as this. We hold the key in our own will power and are therefore responsible. The principle that applies to our families applies to God's family—the whole world, and that means worlds without end, the eternal law of heaven, immutable and unchangeable. We cultivate hate and enmity and make our hell, or cultivate love and friendship and make heaven. The choice is in our own hands. We damn or save ourselves and must not blame the Lord.

**Blind unbelief is sure to err and scan His
works in vain. God is His own interpreter and
He will make it plain.**

Another subject worthy of consideration is the doctrine and theory of evolution as affecting our religious belief. We think many people are unnecessarily agitated and apprehensive over the supposed contradictions of science and religion and imagine evolution another name for infidelity. We think their fears are groundless. If there is any people on earth who should be tolerant towards evolution it is the Latter-day Saints. Darwin has no theory more evolutionary than the Latter-day Saint belief that "what man now is God once was, and

what God now is man may be." That seems to be almost as wide a leap as the monkey to a man, and there is about as much evidence in favor of one as the other, at least the ape, one of the monkey family, and apparently the nearest kin to man. Like the ape, we are always aping after each other. The sisters will go all winter with bare arms and necks to ape after others—leaders of fashion, and men will sweat and swelter through the hot summer months with a coat to ape after others, with no better sense.

But what if God did make man out of a monkey? We must surely allow there is some improvement, something to be grateful for, a feat worthy of admiration. Man may emulate the monkey in many ways, but the best and smartest men, or set of men, that ever lived have never been quite successful in making a genuine man out of a monkey. But if God is able to do it, and has done it, why not take off our hats to Him and worship uncovered in His presence. It surely is a greater feat than making Adam out of dust, or Eve out of a rib.

We can dissect a monkey ourselves and observe the similarity of our own structure, without taking Darwin's word for it. It is self-evident that the same being that made man must have made the monkey or infringed upon another inventor's patent, and we can go on from the monkey down through all the grades of animal life and we will trace the same line of structural form right down to the simple, single cell; or to reverse the investigation, begin with the single cells and trace the improvement and gradual growth of structural complicity right up to man, and there is every evidence of the one Master mind, and uniformity of plan and structure, running through the whole animal kingdom that identifies the one master mechanic or architect. There is no evidence of chance or accident, but is designed of intelligence and divinity.

We trace our most intricate and complex machinery through its gradual development or evolution right back to the simple evolution of a wheel. The first invention was doubtless a wheel revolving on greased axles to reduce friction to a minimum in traveling, and from that simple single wheel has evolved all the complex ma-

chinery of the present time; and yet we do not attribute it to chance nor accident but to the opposite—the evidence of a master mind. The master wheel makes but a simple revolution, but through a master mind we get many complex motions, even to imitate the human hand in the tying of a knot. From the wagon wheel came the drive wheel of the mower, then the master wheel for the reaper, the self rake, and then the binder, all evidence of a master mechanic.

The infidel ridicules the principle of faith as immaterial or impossible, but to attribute these things to chance or accident is a harder strain upon credulity than a belief in design and directing power. It seems easier to believe in a superior power than to disbelieve. It is difficult to account for the infidelic attitude except upon the thesis of the Book of Mormon statement that there must needs be opposition in all things, good and evil, light and darkness, bitter and sweet. Then some men are so obsessed with their own importance as to overwhelm them with the magnitude of their own personality. They imagine it as the mark of weakness to acknowledge a superior power, or concede dependence, or show gratitude. They regard this attitude as unmanly and servile. Or perhaps the requirements of religion to be faithful, and loving, and charitable, and virtuous comes in conflict with their passionate love of self and the indulgence of the physical pleasures of life, and they would fain make themselves believe that the author of these commandments, and executor of the penalties is a myth, and thus justify themselves in following the inclinations of their own hearts, "the natural man, at enmity to God."

But surely the theory of evolution showing an intelligent continuity of improved structural form from the single cell right up to man "fearfully and wonderfully made" does not justify them in this attitude, for it is as sure an evidence of a **God** as the gradual and intelligent structural development and evolution of machinery and mechanical power from a simple revolution of a wheel to the complicated machinery of today is evidence of a **man**. One is as likely to come by change as the other.

With all man's ingenuity in the complicated mechanism of machinery it would be useless and his labors futile

except for the **power** that is beyond the comprehension of man. There can be no master wheel without a master mind, and power behind it. No law without a law-giver, and no laws of any force without a power behind the throne to enforce it. Man's inventions would be useless but for the power embodied and emanating from the sun, familiarly known as "Old Sol." He is the source of all energy, the embodiment of all physical powers, and yet an inexplicable mystery to man. We know of no source of heat and combustion that does not require constant replenishment. The greatest fires ever known to man on earth soon die out for the want of fuel. The world itself on fire would soon burn out, but the sun burns on and on, through the countless ages with undiminished power, without any known source of replenishment. Though all the energy of our earth is derived from our sun, yet it is such a small fractional part of all the energy radiated in every direction from the sun that figures are scarcely adequate to express the smallness of the fractional part. The human mind is bewildered and stupefied in the presence of this stupendous mystery, signifying his inferiority and dependence to some supreme power. How prone is man to boast of his great powers and knowledge in the presence of these over-powering divinities.

Archimedes boasted, "Give me a fulcrum to my lever and I will move the world," and Euclid ran through the streets of Athens crying, "Eureka, Eureka; I have found it, I have found it," when he discovered the relationship of the hypotenuse to the right angle triangle, yet these truths had always existed and were as a primer to the higher intelligence. Truly, as Solomon says, "There is nothing new under the sun."

Newton discovered the law of gravitation that all bodies attract each other in a ratio apportionate to their bulk, and inversely as the square of the distance, but back of this discovery is still the mystery of **why** they attract.

Why does not mater repel instead of attract? No reason can be given except that it would constitute chaos instead of order, everything would go to pieces—to destruction. Love attracts the human family and will adhere them together in one homogeneous whole, while

its opposite, hate, will repel and disintegrate into a heterogeneous confusion that stands for hell, while the former signifies heaven. It represents damnation vs. salvation, joy vs. misery. It is the universal law of the universe.

We note that water attains its greatest density at a certain temperature and from that density expands either way as the temperature rises or falls. In rising it expands into steam that it may be precipitated in rain; or in falling it congeals and expands into floating ice. If this law were reversed, we could have no rain and the earth would be barren and desolate without rain—uninhabitable. Or if it did not expand in freezing the ice would sink so the earth would soon resemble a ball of ice. Does not this beneficent law seem more like design than chance? Are we to attribute all this to luck or chance?

The human system is a living witness to the goodness of God to His Children. Every organ and every function of body and mind bear witness of a divine intelligence. Even the old heathen philosopher Socrates could see the goodness of God in every provision for the comfort and pleasure of His children. He noted that those parts of the body repugnant to the senses of taste and smell were as remote as possible from those organs; and observed that even our sexual pleasures were provided for in that His children might enjoy those pleasures most any time compatible with health and morals, while the brute creation only do so at certain periods and long intervals. Whether absolutely correct in all his deductions or not, we can but admire his wisdom and gratitude in worshipful concession to a higher intelligence or Supreme Being. So many of the learned philosophers are too proud and self-sufficient to acknowledge any superior power or intelligence to themselves. They are not willing to bow in humble acknowledgment of inferiority or dependence to any power. They deny and scout the very idea of miracles as mere childish superstition, and evidence of a weak mind. And yet they are obliged to acknowledge the miracles wrought by man. Oh, but they will say, we can understand and give a cause and explain man's wonderful achievements. We

can perceive how he can communicate instantaneously across continents and even oceans; how he can fly through the air, and see broken bones in the living body through flesh and blood, etc. But we cannot understand these Bible miracles. Well, it isn't so long since you couldn't understand these man made miracles, and perhaps if you will but be patient and reasonable, you will be able to understand God's miracles, and until we do understand them, they are a standing evidence of a superior power to ourselves. Any child that sees the workings of a machine that it can neither manipulate nor understand will concede a superior power or intellect in the construction and working of that machine. And what would we think of an inventor and builder who could not manage his own machine, could not start it and stop it, and reverse it if necessary. And yet men will ridicule the idea of God bringing the sun to a standstill, turning the moon back. According to this view the thing created must be greater than the creator. This would be equal to the clay saying to the potter "what doest thou?" or the vessel to the maker, "what makest thou?" Could we suppose an inventor could not stop his own machine without destroying it; or even reverse it without wrecking it? Oh, but the unbeliever will affirm, "you have not proven that God is the inventor and builder; you are begging the question." The believer has proven his point as far as it is reasonable to prove. An inferior intelligence as the believer concedes himself to be in the presence of these overwhelming mysterious powers, cannot and is not supposed to command this superior intelligence to show himself in person to prove his existence. We can only prove His existence by reason and analogy.

If we see a huge and ingenious machine running in perfect order, doing its work almost like a living intelligence, though we could see no manipulator present, we would not conclude there was no inventor nor director. We would not say it all came by chance or accident, self-created and self-manipulated—perpetual motion. True, it may be arranged to run itself for a time through the action of a governor; but the governor did not make itself. There is still an inventor behind it. We can trace

the action of the knotter in a selfbinder back to the master wheel, but the master wheel did not make itself. There must be power behind the master wheel, as there must be a power behind the throne. There can be no law without a law giver, and a law giver is powerless without a power to execute those laws.

We prove by reason and analogy there is a God, a law-giver and a Holy Spirit to execute those laws, and the burden of proof is upon the unbeliever to disprove it. He is "begging the question," when he assumes that all the order and perfect precision of the starry universe came by chance or accident, without a master or governor, even though there be no visible manipulator.

Infidelic scientists will refer to the floating particles seen in a streak of light in a darkened room as being analogous or explanatory to the universe, but there is no order or system evident in the motion of these particles, but disorder and chaos.

We cannot do better than close with the beautiful lines of Addison in paraphrasing one of the psalms of David:

"The spacious firmament on high
With all the blue ethereal sky,
And sparkled heavens, a shining frame,
Their great original proclaim,
The unwearied sun from day to day
Does his creator's power display,
And publishes to every land
The work of an Almighty hand.

Soon as the evening shades prevail,
The moon takes up the wondrous tale.
And nightly to the listening earth
Repeats the story of her birth;
Whilst all the stars that round her burn,
And all the planets in their turn
Confirm the tidings as they roll
And spread the truth from pole to pole.

What though in solemn silence all
Move round this dark terrestrial ball?
What though no real voice nor sound
Amid their radiant orbs be found?
In reasons ear they all rejoice,
And utter forth a glorious voice,
Forever singing as they shine,
The hand that made us is Divine.

The infidel may presume and insist that the gradual evolution of life from the protoplasm up to man destroys the doctrine of the fall and redemption of man through the gospel. But this is all presumption. He cannot prove that life originates itself from protoplasm. There is no known process by which life can be originated. The wisdom of man stands powerless—stark naked—in the presence of this mystery. Neither can they prove the development, or evolution, of one species out of or into another species. There is not only a missing link between the man and the monkey, but a missing link between every specie. There is nothing in the records of geology to conflict with the records of the Bible as to the separate creations, and the commandment and restriction that each should “multiply after its kind.” The similarity of construction is evidence of the one inventor, but evidently separate and distinct inventions or creations.

The only trace of evolution from one species into another is in the cross of the horse and the ass, but the result is not evolution but revolution—revulsion, reaction, a step backwards, a kick. Mark Twain says, “If a man tells you a mule won’t kick, believe him at once, without reservations or experimentations.”

Job said, “Oh, that my words might be written with an iron pen and laid in the rock forever.” God has made His record of life with an iron pen, and laid it in the rock forever, and the infidel may search these geological records from cover to cover with Sam Veller’s “double-million-magnifying microscope with hextra powers” and they cannot find one trace of the missing link either between the man and the monkey or the monkey and

the dog, or between **any** of the species, and God's irrevocable law to "multiply each after its kind" stands immutable, immaculate and indisputable; each kind is a separate creation—unaccountable except by revelation.

If man is the highest intelligence, how is it that he cannot explain every mystery? If he is the supreme intelligence, there should be no mystery to him. We would be astonished if we found a man running a machine that he claimed to be the inventor and maker of, if he did not understand all about it. We would say at once, "You surely are not the builder of this machine; there must be some higher intelligence than you behind this machine." Every research of man runs back into a mystery that he cannot explain—every science is predicated on a mystery. The scholars cannot account for the origin of life, nor distinguish between a fertile and sterile germ. They cannot determine why matter attracts instead of repelling, except that one means order and the other chaos. They cannot account for the origin of heat and light; electricity is a mystery. They cannot explain how it is that water expands into steam by heat and also expands into ice by withdrawal of heat, except that life depends upon this law.

**Do what is right let the consequence follow,
battle for freedom in spirit and might * * *
God will protect you in doing what is right.**

In treating upon the subject of plural marriage, we have not been unconscious of the delicacy and sacredness of the subject and endeavored, perhaps imperfectly, to avoid unnecessary violence of pure and refined sentiment. But it is difficult to make a reasonable dissertation of this delicate subject without encroaching upon the finer instincts of the feminine nature. However, we cannot afford to be so finicky and prudish as to exclude a reasonable analysis of so important a matter. If no analogy is possible or permissible between human and

brute, the Creator should have made two separate and distinct kingdoms of the animal creation, separated by different worlds so as to preclude the possibility of any comparisons; for it is utterly impossible for intelligent beings to see these things without notice and comparison. The only way to be immune and impervious to these object lessons is to put ourselves under the spell of some opiate or anaesthetic to benumb the conscious sensibilities; otherwise no one but a drunkard or lunatic can help but notice and make mental comparisons.

And is the intelligent observer to be blamed and denounced as indelicate and brutal if he makes observations unfavorable to the human race? Is he at fault if he notices the superiority of the brute sex relationship to that of the human? How can he help but notice there is no red light district in the brute domain? How can he avoid noticing there is no sexual relation except for propagation of their species—no unnecessary or illegitimate union of the sexes—no such a thing as female prostitution, no venereal diseases, no idea of some female being lawfully restrained and deprived of filling the measure of her creation on account of some males declining to fill the measure of their creation. No dog in the manger policy can prevail in their jurisprudence. There is no prostitution of these God given powers there. The only impulse is offspring without limitation of number, no interference with the laws of nature, no feticide nor infanticide, no murder of the innocents. Is it coarse and brutal to note these distinctions? Are we too refined and delicate to profit by these lessons from the brutes? Do such ideas shock our delicate modesty? If there is anything good in the brute creation or in all nature—God's text book—let us learn the lesson and profit by it in spite of all notions of pride and false modesty.

We might wish our domestic animals had sufficient intelligence to learn some lessons of love and paternal affection from us, but if so endowed, their utility would be lost through insubordination to us. Then, if so endowed, they would doubtless object to being compared with human beings. True, the males, like humans, will kill each other at times, but they do not demasculate or

defeminate the natural partners of those unmated and deny them the opportunity of filling the measure of their creation. Men will kill millions of men, and then decline to marry the widows and mateless maidens or allow others to marry them, thus consigning them to a lonely life of widowhood or spinsterhood. And thus the "inhumanity of man to man causes countless thousands to mourn." And still people are shocked and disgusted with the very idea of being compared with animals—a shining light to humans in sexual purity.

However, the comparison was not so much for analogy between brutes and humans in a sexual relation, as to show the inconsistency of a violently shocked moral sensibility at the sight of polygamous relations among neighbors, even to prohibiting, but perfect conscious complacency in forcing these same conditions upon their domestic animals.

"Of all broken reeds, sentimentality is the most broken reed on which righteousness can lean."—Theodore Roosevelt.

Opponents to plural marriage point with pride and confidence to the precedent established by the Lord in the monogamy of Adam and Noah. They insist that if God favored polygamy he would certainly have inaugurated it in both of these beginnings. But the weakness of their case is evident in their eagerness to jump at conclusions and evade close analysis of the subject.

Adam and Eve were immortal sinless beings; so innocent as to be incapable of discerning between good and evil, joy or sorrow; they were guileless as "babes in the woods." War and murder and wickedness did not appear in their path. After the fall to mortality, men began to murder each other, go to war and kill each other by millions; and thousands of other men refused to comply with the command, "multiply and replenish the earth," preferring to bury their God-given powers of increase, or worse still, to prostitute them to unholy purposes destructive to themselves and their seductive companions. Under these dissimilar circum-

stances, is it a reasonable conclusion? We allow it would be hoggish for one man to appropriate a number of wives to himself when they were so scarce as to necessitate the making of them from spare-ribs, as in the Adamic period; but for a man to object to plural marriage now, when there are millions of surplus women, and thousands of men declining to marry even one wife, is worse than the hog; he is the dog in the manger; he interferes with free agency and deprives millions of women from legitimately filling the measure of their creation.

Now, to the disposition of the dispensation of Noah. There seems to have been but eight righteous persons in the time of the flood—four men and four women. To have started them out in the plural form of marriage it would necessitate saving some of the wicked women whom God thought best to drown in the flood. So that monogamy in this case seems to have been incidental rather than intentional, certainly it is no controversial evidence of God's approval or disapproval. There are so many other cases of God's plain and unmistakable approval of plural marriage that it seems idle and childish to waste time discussing the cases of Adam and Noah. Likewise, the cases of his approval are so numerous and plain that one is at a loss to select. We all talk, or prate, about going to Abraham's bosom, and read of King David, "a man after God's own heart" and "sinned in nothing except in the case of the wife of Uriah, the Hittite," the illegitimate issue which God struck with death, but a later issue under holy plural wedlock, Solomon, chosen of the Lord to build his holy temple. The Lord says He gave the wives of Saul to David and would have given him such and such things if he had asked.

Opponents to plural marriage, when driven from other defenses, will barricade themselves behind the Book of Mormon itself, as condemning the principle without reservations. They quote from Jacob, Second chapter, commanding the Nephites to have but one wife, and condemning the polygamy of David and Solomon

as abominable to God, etc. They regard this as an impregnable fortress against plural marriage. But let us sound its walls.

Plural marriage is not the direct subject of his discourse, but **fornications** and **whoredoms**, of which some of the people were guilty and were seeking to **justify** themselves with the practices of David and Solomon. The commandment to have but one wife had been given to them previously through Lehi.

There is no doubt but that David and Solomon went to extremes in plural marriage. If David had not been harboring evil in his heart, he never would have fell into sin with the wife of Uriah, his neighbor. Such sins are not hatched without incubation; but the fact that God destroyed the illegitimate issue of this union, but honored and appointed Solomon, a later issue of this same couple under plural marriage, seems to be incontrovertible evidence of God's approval and sanction of this principle, especially when coupled with the plain statement that David was a man "after God's own heart and sinned in nothing except in the case of the wife of Uriah." The Lord says, "I gave the wives of Saul into thy bosom, and would have given thee more if thou had asked." Now to condemn the moderate practice of plural marriage in David would be God condemning himself, the giver of the wives. Who would not be disgusted with the thousand wives and concubines of Solomon? He must have been disgusted with them himself, and they with him and each other.

But the Latter-day Saints are not seeking to justify themselves either in polygamy or **fornication** by the conduct of David and Solomon, but justifying themselves in polygamy by a commandment of the Lord given through the Prophet Joseph Smith as recorded in Doc. and Cov., Sec. 132, in accordance with the intimation in this same second chapter of Jacob that "If I will, sayeth the Lord of Hosts, raise up unto me seed I will command my people; otherwise they shall hearken to these things." Now if plural marriage is not right, never was right, and never will be right, why should God put in this proviso—this "if," and ignore this splendid opportunity of settling this knotty problem

for once and all, that this principle never would be re-instated? Will we accuse God of trifling with His children? If the Woodruff Manifesto countermands this commandment, why does it not say so in plain words and not leave us in doubt? But it does not claim to be from the Lord. There is not the remotest reference to Deity in the whole document. It does not even claim to be a **commandment** of **man**, but a suggestion by way of advice.

Plural marriage affords a wife better opportunity of living an ideal life of marital purity, and even the husband is restrained by a religious sense of responsibility to God, and exemplar of purity and refinement to his wives that there may be mutual confidence and respect. To the pure in heart there is an incentive to live above suspicion of impure motives—an aspiration to live by inspiration, that when their secret lives are proclaimed from the house tops they may not be put to shame.

There is more play and less friction in polygamous families than in monogamous families, and consequently fewer divorces. The least incompatibility of temperament in monogamy often becomes binding and galling, and unbearable, that under the more elastic conditions of plural marriage might be tolerable, reconcilable and even curable.

A gang plow will always run steadier than a single plow. A four-wheel vehicle steadier and safer than a cart or a wheelbarrow, a six or four-cylinder motor better than two. A single-cylinder is useless and dangerous.

Three persons linked arm in arm are less likely to slip and fall than if walking singly. Freedom and democracy lead side by side; autocracy and royalty follow in each others' dust. The man of good horse sense will hitch his team abreast double, treble or quadruple, while aristocrats drive tandem.

Why the 3rd and 4th Chapters of Isaiah should have been divided into two chapters is one of the mysteries. The 4th Chapter is very short, and as any one can see naturally belongs to the 3rd Chapter; it is all one subject, and is generally conceded to appertain to modern times. The seven women taking hold of one man, begging to be called in his name, must certainly be modern and indicative of the prophetic power of the prophet Isaiah; for in ancient times, women were not called in the name of their husband; they were not called Mrs. Adam, Mrs. Abraham, Mrs. David, etc.—this modern custom could only be known to a prophet.

In the 3rd Chapter he gives a graphic description of the modern daughters of Zion. He takes note of their "stretched forth necks," and "walking and mincing as they go." Of course, with the hobble skirts they must of necessity mince their footsteps as they go; and in noting the elasticity of their "stretched necks" he probably did not distinguish which end was extended—stretched up or down. But it is a mathematical certainty that if the decollete continues to stretch downward and the skirts shrivel upward, they must meet some time. "Therefore, the Lord will smite with a scab the crown of the head of the daughters of Zion, and the Lord will discover their secret parts." (Ch. 3:17.) The reference to the "ornaments of the legs"—the camouflage of flesh-colored silk stockings, is significant.

The climax to these conditions comes in "Thy men shall fall by the sword and thy mighty in the war. And her gates shall lament and mourn, and she being desolate shall sit upon the ground." Then comes the seven women to one man and the "washing away of the filth of the daughters of Zion" in the 4th Chapter.

The testimony of President Lorenzo Snow and the revelation by President John Taylor, together with the Woodruff Manifesto, are placed in the back of Gospel Problems without comment, supposing it would be unnecessary, but we are surprised to find that some people are too obtuse to make a reasonable comparison. It surely requires but a modicum of mental acumen to see

that a political declaration or manifestation cannot annul a revelation from God, and neutralize the testimony of President Snow.

Abraham Lincoln belonged to no church, but he never wrote an important public document that did not contain some reference to the Supreme Being, and yet this Manifesto, supposed by many to be a revelation to revoke and annul the revelations of God to Joseph Smith and John Taylor, does not contain the remotest reference to the Supreme Being, much less "Thus Sayeth the Lord."

"The feeling that has always prevailed with me is that it is my duty to be kind and to listen and learn the truth, and when you learn it, when you get possession of the truth then you stand on firm ground; for truth is mighty, and truth will prevail. When you obtain possession of a principle of truth, let the world shake to pieces, let the heavens fall, and the stars tremble, but stand by that truth and never swerve from it, nor yield from it, living or dead. That is what I believe and I believe that is right, but it takes sometimes a good deal of mellowness of spirit, mildness and softness of spirit, and some humiliation, perhaps, to yield to what is apparently inevitable that seems to come in contrast and in contact with that which we know to be right; and then, at least temporarily, yield to it and suffer it to be. Now, what I refer to in this regard is certainly a principle that I need not mention here tonight, but which always comes up to my mind as a principle. I never have embraced a principle of this gospel that I have not believed with all my soul is from God and was revealed to man through the Prophet Joseph Smith. I believe that every principle I have embraced is true."—J. F. Smith on his 75th birthday anniversary.

Let us give a few moments' attention to Lehi's vision of the Iron Rod, the Word of God, as recorded in 1st Nephi, 12th Chapter. He saw many cling to the rod and follow the strait and narrow path until they

came to the tree of life, and after partaking of the precious fruit were ashamed of the finger of scorn pointed at them by those in the great and spacious building in the attitude of mocking at those partaking of the fruit, in consequence of which many fell away and "wandered in by and forbidden paths," but Lehi says: "We heeded them not." Are we doing likewise? When the Gentiles mock at the imperfections of the Book of Mormon, do we heed them not, or do we apologize for the illiteracy of the translator? When they mock at the Adam-God doctrine, do we heed them not, or do we repudiate it as merely the doctrine of Brigham Young? When they mock and point the finger of scorn at the doctrine of plural marriage, and legislate against it, do we heed them not? or do we wiggle and twist and squirm out of it? and proclaim that polygamy is dead and buried, never to be resurrected? Is this also merely a doctrine of Brigham Young? as the Josephites say it is. Are we so fearful of persecution and imprisonment and martyrdom that we will cower and surrender every principle that God has revealed to distinguish us from the people of the world, in order to be in perfect harmony with Babylon? Where is the "great and terrible gulf" dividing us from Babylon today? (I Nephi, 12-18.) We sing "Up, Awake Ye Defenders of Zion, the foe's at the door of your Homes, Let each heart be the heart of a Lion, Unyielding and proud as they roam." "Thou wear a lion's hide? Doff it for shame and hang a calfskin on those recreant limbs."

It runs in our minds like an instinct that as our pioneer mothers crooned this hymn above the hum of their spinning wheels it ran "**firm**" as he roamed, instead of "proud." However, we recognize the sense of eternal fitness in changing the adjective and we might recognize the same fitness in substituting the noun "peacock" for "lion."

"Her warriors are noble and brave"—about as brave as a jackrabbit, and as noble as his namesake. "Remember the wrongs of Missouri, Forget not the fate of Nauvoo, when the God-hating foe is before you, stand firm and be faithful and true." Instead of remembering these robbings and mobbings we are in danger of forgetting

them altogether, and also the souls under the altar crying night and day, "How long, O Lord, Holy and true, will thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth—" danger of forgetting to teach our children and our children's children to never cease praying for this vindication.

We are about as true to our colors, the "Red, White and Blue," as is the chameleon. We sing "Our faith on Jehovah is founded," but we cry Good Lord and Good Devil as though we were fearful as to whose hands we would fall into. Where is the faith of Daniel and his three brethren, Shadrack, Machack and Obednego? How long can we carry water on both shoulders? We are reminded of Steven A. Douglass trying to carry both southern and northern democracy.

**For it shall come to pass that the inhabitants
of Zion shall judge all things pertaining to Zion.
—Doc. & Cov., Sec. 64:38.**

The authorities of the church are very insistent that all revelations for the guidance and instructions of the Saints shall and must come through them—the regular channel of the organized priesthood. This is all very good to guard against cranks and imposters and false prophets, but may not this idea be carried to an extreme until it leads to a monopoly of spiritual power, and even to oppression or suppression. You remember there was an idea extant that all law should be for the protection and encouragement of capital and the upper classes—the trusts and corporations, with the idea that prosperity would be sure to trickle down to the lower classes—the laboring people; but the people got it into their heads that it was just as well to legislate a little for the lower classes, that prosperity to the masses might work its way up through the classes to the aristocracy above. They got tired and hungry, from eating the crumbs from the rich man's table, and demanded that they be given a seat at the table in a fair and equal chance.

Of course, there are extremes in all things and any

good thing may be run to an evil by extremes. The miser is one extreme and the prodigal son the other. The truth almost invariably lies half way between two extremes—the strait and narrow way. So it may be just possible to become extremely solicitous in guarding the channels of communication to the church. You cannot stop the mouth of the Lord. He will speak to whom He will, and if the regular channels become clogged and choked with money-making schemes, or love for the honors of men, the Lord must not be bound with red tape and prevented from inspiring others to do His will. Under such circumstances it might be as well to inspire the people and let the inspiration work up, like financial prosperities, instead of downward. We all have noticed that heat and steam will work upward better than downward. The fire is more effective underneath the boiler than on top. There might be such a thing as good leadership resulting from inspiration through the people.

You know the Lord has objected to kings on the grounds that such leadership did not come direct from the choice of the people governed. He desired that the people should lead, through the free and untrammelled choice; that inspiration should work up from the masses and the leadership be thoroughly representative of the people. If their choice was good, the fruits would be good and deserving—if the people became bad their choice would become bad and the fruit bad and they would suffer according to their just merits. It is genuine democracy. Suffering is necessary to bring repentance, so that free government is automatic and self-regulative. If the fountain is good the water will be good. You do not gather grapes from thorns, nor figs from thistles, nor good leadership from corrupt people, nor bad leadership from virtuous people. The leadership should be representative of the people, and not the people representative of the leadership.

True, we have had good leadership in kings, such as Nephi, King Benjamin, Mosiah and Hezekiah, but they are exceptions to the rule. The 29th Chapter of Mosiah is the best and plainest dissertation on civil government we ever read; replete with fatherly love and wisdom equal to whole volumes of learned opinions of uninspired

historians and jurists of the world—read it. Even the Lord's choice and anointed King Saul, and David, and Solomon went astray, and may not have been truly representative of the people. The only safe person to be entrusted with full power is the Lord Himself, and when He comes He will reign as Lord of Lords and King of Kings in righteousness. But until then we are instructed "to trust no man to be your teacher or minister except he be a man of God, walking in His ways and keeping His commandments." (Mosiah 23:14.) But we cannot do this without a free and untrammelled vote. Hence the Lord has said that all things should be done by common consent in His church. (Doc. and Cov., Sec 26.) But if we are not free to vote yes or no according to our free and untrammelled choice, it is not common consent. The privilege of voting but one way is a snare and a delusion, a mockery of freedom; it must be not only free in theory but in practice. An open vote is a dangerous and very doubtful method of choice, especially when not accompanied with the free and open discussion. We have a church rule that voting shall be open, but the discussion secret or private.

This may work all right so long as everybody is good and unselfish, but so soon as differences arise and everybody is not just what they should be, it becomes a dangerous rule. It will not work, except as a miracle, nor be tolerated in any civilized government on earth, except with the Latter-day Saints. Germany and Russia came the nearest to it, but it has failed there, miserably. We make a great deal of President Wilson's declarations of "open covenants openly made," but an open vote and private discussion is an entirely different thing. O, but some will say, church matters are different from civil or political matters; but we think they are creating a distinction without a difference. There can be no distinction between religious liberty and civil liberty. If there is any it should be in favor of religious liberty. The freedom of the conscience to worship God according to dictates of conscience is more important than civil liberty—as eternity is greater than time, soul than body. If an open vote and private discussion is wrong in one, it must be wrong in the other. If right in one case, it is

right in the other, especially if the laws of the land are perfect.

If this rule will always work righteousness in the church, it is because God makes it work in a "mysterious way His wonders to perform." It may work so long as our leaders are guaranteed to be good, but no longer. "We have learned by sad experience that it is the nature and disposition of almost all men as soon as they get a little authority as they suppose they will begin to exercise unrighteous dominion."—Doc. and Cov., Sec. 21:29.

For this very reason the Lord gave us the franchise in His church, and we are derelict in our God-given duty if we do not exercise it.

We often hear it said that God will never allow any man to lead this church astray, and that He will remove any man who tries to do so; but the Lord gave us the right and power to do this ourselves; otherwise He would have told us to follow our leaders without voting. If He guarantees our leaders there is no need of the vote, and further the leaders should not ask, or invite us to vote if they are guaranteed to always be right; for an invitation to vote is an invitation to differ, and if it is wrong to differ with authority, it is wrong to **tempt** us to differ. Is there any getting away from this logic? Is it right that we should throw all the responsibility on to the Lord when He has put it on to us with the vote? Must we shirk the responsibility and insist that God strike the leader with death as "by the vivid shaft of lightning," rather than exercise the right and duty of the franchise? He has put it in our hands to see that no man, or set of men, lead us astray. If we are led astray, it is our own fault, for the Lord has placed the responsibility and remedy in our hands and command us to use it; and if we are led astray we must blame ourselves.

If God is so particular about authority, how is it He would suffer Nephi, the youngest of the Lehi colony, to lead even his father, the founder and leader of the colony? At one time he was in opposition to his father and older brethren. He says: "I did preach unto them with all the energy of my soul." King Noah was duly appointed and anointed leader and king by a godly father, Zeniff, but he went astray and was leading the

people wrong when God inspired Abinidi to criticise his authority, and that publicly too, and they burnt him to death. Alma took up the good cause against the authority by secret teaching and preaching. Eli, the high priest of the temple, displeased the Lord by sustaining his sons unworthily in temple work, and the Lord inspired a man of God to reprove him, and tell him that in consequence of this indulgence and tolerance of sin, in his sons, they "should die, and there never should be another old man in the house of Eli." This is not only an example of proper criticism of authority, but an evidence that God is "no respecter of persons, and that He cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance"—whether it be in leaders themselves, or their sons, or son-in-laws. It is an example of what extremes will lead to. Extreme love of kindred even to the toleration of sin; extreme love of loyalty to leaders will lead to the same thing. The loyal followers of Saul and David and Solomon, following in the footsteps of their file leaders, went wrong with them. Then, as now, there were not many Nathans or Samuels. O, but some will say, these were God's prophets. Well, may not God have prophets to do the same thing now? Is He not the same today, yesterday and forever? And is not human nature the same? Jesus called the leaders of the Jews "whited sepulchres," who "garnished the tombs of the ancient prophet and stoned the prophets who came among them." If God should send Nathan or Samuel today, who would believe them? God has promised to send "one mighty and strong and one like unto Moses." See Doc. and Cov., Sec. 85 and Sec. 103. But the authorities say this revelation never was nor never will be fulfilled; that it is obsolete, and so of course will not accept him when he comes. Peter held the keys of the kingdom anciently, but when Paul saw him playing two parts, one thing to the Jews and another to the Gentiles, his righteous indignation was kindled and he boldly criticised his deceptive attitude publicly and "withstood him to the face for he was to be blamed." (Galatians, 2:11.)

No doubt the Lord justified him and will justify like conduct today under similar circumstances.

"So, when you speak of the one who stands by the voice of the people, and by the voice and will of God,

at the head of the Church, as being a prophet, seer and revelator, I don't want you to forget the fact that there are tens of thousands of our people called to be prophets and revelators in the spheres in which they are called to act; and when you honor the head, honor the body, the limbs; honor each branch in its place, and hold in sacred remembrance and in sacred reverence the rights and privileges and endowments that God has bestowed upon his children who have been faithful before him in keeping his commandments and in doing and working righteousness in the earth." J. F. Smith, 75th birthday anniversary.

We hear people say, "What is the use of praying for the authorities if we are not going to sustain them?" We might answer, "What is the use of praying for the authorities to keep in the right way unless we add works to our faith by helping to keep them right. Keep them right by our vote and counsel, as well as prayers. It is pure nonsense to say we have no right to counsel those who are above us. Then the counsellors of any presidency have no right to counsel the president over them—the very thing for which they are called. Solomon said, "In the multitude of counsel there is safety." Joseph F. Smith said before the Smoot Investigating Committee he was always ready and glad to take counsel from all good men and women. The Lord told Oliver Cowdery to reprove Joseph Smith, the prophet, in his faults and receive admonition from him. No doubt the people prayed for Saul and David and Solomon, but consistency did not insist they should follow them in case they went wrong. No doubt Paul prayed for Peter, but consistency prompted him to add works to his faith by trying to keep Peter in the right way. It is the duty of the ward teachers to teach the Bishops, President of Stake and President of the church in that capacity and admonish them of their faults. It is hard to think intelligent people will argue they must follow the leaders, right or wrong, without question, because we pray for them. If by following leaders who lead us to the wrong place, will we make the plea that we were bound to follow them in order to be consistent? The answer will doubtless be, "You had your free agency."

We pray for the authorities of our nation, or should do, but that does not mean that we shall always agree with them and follow them. Are the Republicans disloyal and false in talking and voting in opposition to a Democratic president? The mere hint of such a thing by President Wilson before the last election drove the whole country Republican.

But some will insist religion is different to politics. Well, we would not have the church descend to the same level with political graft and wire pulling, but there should not be so much difference between good civil government and good church government. The kingdom of the stone cut out of the mountain is to be a civil as well as church government, spiritual and temporal; a theocracy, and it is to fill the whole earth.

Our excuse for consuming so much time and space over this simple matter is that good intelligent saints raise these objections to differing with authority of the church, but it seems so plain that a child should not err therein.

The authorities themselves are differing now over the League of Nations and it is gradually crystallizing into a political issue and bone of contention over which to scrap for the next presidential election and quoting the same scripture to battle each other. Both mutilate the scriptures and run off to extreme, leaving a strait and narrow path high and dry, dividing and bewildering the people until they hardly know which way to turn or what to believe. Senator Smoot quotes the 35th verse of the preface section of the Doc. and Cov., or rather part of it, cutting a sentence off at a comma. He quotes, "For I am no respecter of persons, and will that all men shall know that the day speedily cometh, the hour is not yet, but is nigh at hand when peace shall be taken from the earth." But why not go on? Why stop at a comma? "And the devil shall have power over his own dominion." The inference from this end of the sentence is that the devil would have power over all the nations, this nation included, and that would be unpopular. Shall we withhold the truth because it is unpopular? Lincoln said he knew it was unpopular to say that the civil war was a "judgment on both North and South" but that "it was a

truth that needed to be told, and that he probably could better afford to tell it than any one else."

It is regrettable that the watchmen upon the towers of Zion are less courageous than Lincoln, who belonged to no church (See Ez. 33 Ch.) Roberts and Smoot both quote and mutilate the 12th verse of 2nd ch. of Ether in the same way, stopping at a comma. It was not so much the comma as the big "if" that stopped them. We all remember the story of how the devil proposed to save all mankind without any "if," without repentance, or baptism, or the Ten Commandments. He was too generous. He was determined to save everybody, good or bad. It was very popular with many and might have prevailed, but God knew that such a salvation without free agency would be worthless. No one could take comfort in a salvation costing them nothing, that came free, without effort or sacrifice, so Christ's plan of repentance and baptism and free agency prevailed. It had a big "if" in it. But our brethren think of adopting Satan's plan and excluding the "if" in the scripture quoted. Here it is: "Behold this is a choice land, and whatsoever nation shall possess it shall be free from bondage and from captivity and from all other nations under heaven **IF** they will but serve the God of the land who is Jesus Christ who hath been manifested by the things which we have written." You see, the good things are promised on conditions, "if they will serve the God of the land." Instead of omitting the conditional part of the sentence they should include the five preceding paragraphs, so they might take warning from the fate of the Jaredites and Nephites. It is our bounden duty to give this solemn warning. See Ez. 33rd Ch.

"If the blind lead the blind they must fall in the ditch together."

The Lord has said: "I will lift up an ensign to the nations, and hiss unto them from the ends of the earth."

As Latter-day Saints we claim to be that ensign—the chosen people of God to be a light and example to the whole earth, and the Lord has commanded us to let our light so shine, that the world may see it and give glory to God.

Are we doing it? Or are we hiding our light under a bushel and obsequiously following in the light of the nations of Babylon, walking in the light of Wilson and Taft and Lloyd George and Clemenceau? Is this filling our mission, and calling, to be an ensign and standard to the nations? Must we borrow oil from them, or walk in their reflected light? Or are we just catering and soft-soaping with fulsome flattery?

We are supposed to represent the Celestial Kingdom, typified by the sun, while they, the honorable men of the earth, are supposed to represent the Terrestrial Kingdom, typified by the moon, moving in her secondary sphere by the reflected light of the sun—the Celestial sphere, with the still lesser lights, the stars, representing the Terrestrial Kingdom, and subordinated to the moon. These three kingdoms are thus represented and symbolized in the 76th Sec. of Doc. and Cov., and also in the 15th Chapter of I Corinthians. They are too plain to be misunderstood. A child may read as he walks and understand, and yet we as Latter-day Saints, claiming to be the Celestial light of the world, reverse God's order, sell our birthright for a mess of pottage in the savory pot of popularity, and degrade ourselves to walk in the midnight gloom and uncertain lights of the moon and stars. "They have sinned a very grievous sin in that they are walking in darkness at noon day." Doc. and Cov., Sec. 95:6. Why not let our light of revelation and prophesy so shine that the world may see it and give glory to God, instead of chasing after the tail of every wandering comet? We first go daffy over Bryan, and then bow down to McKinley; then worship Roosevelt,

and like a lone star shine for Taft, and suddenly turn turtle for Wilson and Bamberger. And now, like sheep without a shepherd, we fall over each other trying to follow all of them—Taft, Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, et. al. Why should we play second fiddle to any of these lesser lights? Joseph Smith, the Prophet, refused to do so—repudiated all of them, and ran for the Presidency on his own hook. His name sake, Joseph, sold into Egypt, received a dream from the Lord, representing him (Joseph) as the Sun and his father and brothers as the moon and stars bowing to him, the son and younger brother; and he boldly proclaimed it to them; he saw all their sheaves bow down to make obeisance to his sheaf, and the Lord inspired him to tell his dream even though he incurred the displeasure of his brethren, and even his doting father. And further, he planned and labored for their fulfillment and was not satisfied until he saw their consummation in the obeisance of his brethren to him in Egypt.

The boy prophet Joseph hesitated not to tell them they were "all wrong, their professors corrupt and their creeds an abomination in his sight." Are our hearts so set upon the things of this world and aspire to the honors of men that we cannot follow the example of this boy prophet and proclaim the truth—the message that God has given us to give to the world? If we fail to warn them and call them to repentance, their blood will be upon our hands. (See Ezekiel 33 Chap.)

Jesus noted that the Jews were constantly complimenting and throwing boquets at each other in their immoderate desire for the honors of men, and said, "How can ye believe, which receive honors one of another and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" (St. John 5:44.) Jesus and His apostles were not given to holding mutual admiration parties. Even when Peter cut off the soldier's ear in defense of Jesus, He rebuked Him, and when Peter protested that though all men deserted Him, he never would, Jesus repulsed his servility with, "before the cock crows ye will deny me thrice." And Paul publicly took Peter to task, and "withstood him to the face, for he was to be blamed." Their first honor was to God, their own honors were made secondary.

We are commanded to love each other, but not to tickle each other; fulsome flattery and obsequious submission is specious idolatry and a perversion of genuine loyalty. "The wounds of a friend are better than the kisses of an enemy" (Solomon). Paul's rebuke to Peter was loyal, but the kiss of Judas was traitorous.

If any one should publicly or privately withstand our President to his face as Paul did Peter, most saints would expect to see him struck dead, and the least possible penalty would be immediate apostacy.

Now going back to the core of our subject—we are making a great deal to do about this League of Nations. It reminds us of the cry of the Ephesians. "Great is Dianna, the God of the Ephesians." These nations are all "drunken in iniquity, and all manner of abominations." (2 Nephi, 27:1.)

And this nation is "lifted up in the pride of their hearts above all nations, and above all the people of the whole earth and filled with all manner of lying and deceit, and of mischiefs and all manner of hypocrisy and murder and priestcraft, whoredoms and of secret abominations." Jesus Christ in 3 Nephi, 16, 1.0 And yet they think to adopt this great panacea and cure all the abominations with this League of Nations. You might as well seek to save a band of robbers and thieves with a league and covenant, or tie a bunch of Kilkenney cats together by the tails to insure peace and order.

The United Order was given to the Saints "for their temporal and spiritual salvation," and will be adopted before the Lord will come to live with us; but to adopt it now in our state of pride and selfishness would make matters worse instead of better. The Saints must first be chastened and humbled and purified before we can live peaceably and orderly in this Order. If a man's family love the Lord and each other, the closer they are united temporally and spiritually, the better; but if they do not love the Lord nor each other, the less they have to do with each other the better. So it is with these wicked nations. They do not love the Lord nor each other. They must accept the Gospel and learn to love God and each other before they can live in any league or covenant. "But they **receive it not, for they perceive not**

the light and turn their hearts from Me because of the precepts of men, and in that generation shall the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Doctrine and Cov., Sec. 45, 23,30. And again, for behold and lo, vengeance cometh speedily upon the ungodly as the whirlwind, and who shall escape it? The Lord's scourge shall pass over by night and by day and the report thereof shall vex all people; yet it **shall not be stayed until the Lord come.**" Sec. 97:22, 23. He said I will turn them to the **hardness of their hearts and the blindness of their minds** even to bringing them down unto captivity and destruction **both temporally and spiritually.** (I Nephi, 14.) He further says, "Satan goeth forth to deceive the nations," and "I am withholding my spirit from the inhabitants of the earth." Then shall We Latter-day Saints, supposed to be a light to all the world, follow this blind lead? Led by Satan and devoid of the Spirit of God? Or shall we walk in the direct rays of the Celestial light of prophecy and revelation, warn them of their wickedness and call them to repentance?

"One fault to be avoided by the Saints, young and old, is the tendency to live on borrowed light, with their own hidden under a bushel; to permit the savor of their salt of knowledge to be lost; and the light within them to be reflected rather than original. Every Saint should not only have the light within himself through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit but his light should so shine that it may be clearly perceived by others.

"Men and women should become settled in the truth, and founded in the knowledge of the gospel, depending upon no person for a borrowed or reflected light, but trusting only upon the Holy Spirit, who is ever the same, shining forever and testifying to the individual and the priesthood to live in harmony with the laws of the gospel, of the glory and the will of the Father. They will then have life everlasting, which cannot be obscured. By its shining in their lives, they shall cause others to glorify God; and by their well-doing put to silence the ignorance of foolish men, and show forth the praises of him, who hath called them out of darkness into his marvelous light." (Joseph F. Smith, Gospel Doc., page 107.)

The folly and danger of walking by borrowed light is evident in our observance of Good Friday as the crucifixion day. If Christ was crucified on Friday and rose Sunday morning as apostate Christendom presumes, then He did not lie in the grave three days, but only one day, Saturday. But Jesus said: "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh a sign but none shall be given, but the sign of Jonah; and as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Now who are we to believe Christ or the Catholic Church? Evidently Christ was crucified on Wednesday and was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, rising Sunday morning, which began at sundown Saturday night, in accordance with Jewish reckoning. The Sabbath following his crucifixion was doubtless one of the feastday Sabbaths. The Feast of Tabernacles, Day of Pentecost, Passover, etc., were all called Sabbaths by the Jews, as our Sabbaths are called holidays. Good Friday as Crucifixion Day is as erroneous as Christmas for his birthday. If Christ's body was in the tomb only Saturday there should have been but one day of darkness in America instead of three.

Now it is better that a man be judged of God than of man, for the judgments of God are always just, but the judgments of man are not always just.—Mosiah 29:12.

We listened to President Grant's discourses at the October Conference and the one two weeks before on the League of Nations, etc., and have read them in the Deseret News and reread them in the Conference report and the Era and mentally digested them as best we can with our limited power of mentality.

We find many good things in them—much poetry and hymns pertinent and relevant to the subject matter in hand, with all due allowance for poetical license. But in numerating the favorite hymns of our leaders we cannot help noticing some sentiments like these: "On the

necks of thy foes thou shalt tread." "The Gentiles shall bow neath thy rod," etc. Also "Up, awake, ye defenders of Zion. The foes at the door of your homes. Remember the wrongs of Missouri. Forget not the fate of Nauvoo. When the God-hating foe is before you, stand firm and be faithful and true."

Now how do we frame up with these favorite sentiments today? It is very proper and fitting that we should slack up occasionally and determine, if possible, where we are at, and take note of the starry heavens through the reef-broken clouds, and ascertain, if possible, our latitude and longitude with reference to the Signs of the Times. Are we filling our calling as an ensign to the nations, symbolizing the Celestial light of the sun, reflecting light to the lesser orbs of the firmament? Or are we obsequiously following the uncertain light of the moon and wandering stars and hanging to the tail of some glamoring comet, trying to get light from Taft and Wilson and Lloyd George, instead of the Lord Jesus—following Paris and Rome, the mother of harlots, and Japan, with Shantung? Next, like a drowning man grasping at straws, we will be clutching to the tail of the celestial Chinaman, when we should be a light to the whole world. We have the holy scriptures, and the light of prophecy and revelation; why not walk by them and call on the nations to follow us? The Lord says, "They have sinned a very grievous sin that they walk in darkness at noon day." Doc. and Cov., Sec. 95. If the blind lead the blind, where is our safety? It is irrevocably decreed that Babylon must fall, and the Kingdom of God established in her stead. But we can never fulfill our destiny by following Babylon to destruction.

In this discourse we read: "No Latter-day Saint can in very deed be a Latter-day Saint if he does not honor and sustain and uphold the law." Now Latter-day Saints have suffered sufficiently at the hands of mobocrats to fully convert them to the necessity and beneficence of law and order, so far as the moral law of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is concerned. We have been mobbed and robbed and murdered and driven until it has been burned into our souls so indelibly that we don't need very much preaching about it. There is

a possibility of having too much of a good thing. We fully understand that God wants us to be law abiding to the extent of good citizenship; to the extent of "observing that law which is the constitutional law of the land and uphold the rights and freedom that belong to all mankind and is justifiable before me; and that anything more or less than this cometh of evil." Doc. and Cov., Sec. 98.

To claim that we cannot be true Latter-day Saints without strict obedience to every law of the land, irrespective of its justice and constitutionality, is not consistent; it is not true. Daniel would not do it, nor his three Hebrew brethren, and they were **indeed** true Former-day Saints. Hundreds of Latter-day Saints have gone to prison because they would not do it. President John Taylor died a martyr in exile rather than do it, and men were dropped from their positions in the church because they promised to obey the law of the land. Joseph F. Smith would not do it, but went on the underground for years, and had 11 children born after the manifesto by five mothers.

Well, the objector will say; would you preach lawlessness? Certainly not. But we can let it alone. We don't need it; we understand it pretty well, we have had it burned into our souls by practical experience, so that we don't need much preaching about it. Why not just go right along quietly, sawing wood and saying nothing?

**"Every way of a man is right in his own eyes,
but the Lord pondereth the hearts."—Prov. 21:2.**

"I want to say that I am perfectly willing that men shall join labor unions, that they shall band together for the purpose of protecting their rights, provided they do not interfere with the rights of other people. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness belong to all people in these United States according to the laws of our country, and should, upon all the face of the earth, and I say that, to my mind, a provision in a labor union is all wrong that

favors boycotting and the laying down of tools or the quitting of employment because a non-union man obtains employment while exercising his God-given right to stay out of a union. Men who have that kind of a rule have a rule that is in direct opposition to the laws of God. There was a battle fought in heaven—for what? To give to man his individual liberty. An attempt to take the agency of man away is made when he does not see fit to join a union, when men in that union without any complaint, or grievance, strike, because a non-union man is employed.” H. J. Grant, C. R., Oct., 1919.

At first thought this sounds very fair, but God has given us all thinkers and it is a God given right, a duty, to use them. Why do laboring men combine into unions? Because capital has so combined, and if labor didn't follow suit, it would be crushed. Conditions here would be as they are in Mexico, where the peons work for 50 cents a day and board themselves, and an employer would no more think of saying “Good Morning” to his hired man than he would to his dog. To avoid Mexican conditions, our laboring men have combined into labor unions, and try to put up as solid a front as capital does, otherwise they cannot win. Big capitalists try to consolidate all the interests into trusts and corporations, so as to cut out competition, and put up prices on their products. The sugar and salt interests have so combined, and labor is almost driven to do likewise in order to put wages high enough to purchase the sugar and salt. The big Sugar Company either buys, or pools, or fools, with all the smaller companies to cut out competition and make sugar the highest price in the world right here in a sugar center where it ought by all the natural laws of free trade and competition be the cheapest. The Inter-mountain Salt Company resorted to the same methods of persuasion and coercion to get all the little salt owners to join in one-big salt company, and make salt the highest price in the world in this land of salt, where it ought to be the cheapest.

Some of the little salt owners resented this pressure to enter into combination as an unholy and unjust and unrighteous interference with free trade and “free agency,” and one man at least, Chas. Smurthwaite, for-

ferited his church standing in opposition. Now the labor unions have profited by these lessons and are using the same methods to coerce non-union men to join these ranks for high wages. They are spending time and money to procure a living wage, and they feel that it is unfair for non-union men to shirk the expense, and follow behind, rejoicing in the good wages obtained through the union men's efforts. The united beet growers are up against the same problem. Some beet growers will not join in the expense of the union, but gladly follow and reap the benefit in the higher price of beets. Wool-growers' associations have the same experience, and would bring pressure to compel all woolmen to join in the expense of the benefits they share if they could. People are obliged by taxation to do their share at building school houses, but our meeting houses and amusement halls, etc., are built by voluntary donation, and we do not feel well towards those who participate in these benefits without contributing to the expense.

Labor unions feel the same way. Human nature is much the same the world over; it is the first law of life, self-preservation—"the survival of the fittest." "Might makes right" sounds harsh, and feels cold, but it's a philosophy that's hard to get away from, and about all we can do is to work and pray for the happy time when might and right will be synonymous. God is might, and He is always right. Now it is better that a man should be judged of God than of man, for the judgments of God are always just, but the judgments of man are not always just." Mosiah 29:12. Capital goes off to one extreme and labor to the other, but the right lies half way between the two, and is the strait and narrow way. Let us not be too strong-headed or stiff-necked, and look to but one side or the other, but try to see things fairly and unprejudiced as God sees them. Rich and poor are all His children, and He can see things as an impartial father.

The father of the prodigal son could see and judge fairly between his two sons, as no one else could, unless it was the mother, and we hope we have a Heavenly Mother. There were faults on both sides; the older son was not perfect.

The Democrats run to one extreme and the Republicans to the other in their ideas of good government, but the government of God half way between the two is **right** and it will be made **might** in His own due time.

Speaking of Babylon that is to fall He says: "How much she hath glorified herself and lived deliciously, so much sorrow and torment given her, for she sayeth in her heart, I sit a queen and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow; therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death and mourning and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Rev. 18:1, 8. We seem to be digressing, but this is all germane to the subject in hand. This terrible struggle between capital and labor will culminate in a united strike of all the unions that will literally fulfill the above prophecy. The immediate outlook is gloomy, but we must look farther to the reign of peace and righteousness that is to follow the storm, when there will be "no rich and no poor," and "every man will seek the interest of his neighbor."

But we cannot see nor believe this except God softens our hearts and quickens our understanding with the spirit of prophecy and testimony of Jesus. This the Lord will grant to those only who **diligently** seek Him by fasting and prayer. The Lord said to Nephi: "Blessed art thou, Nephi, because thou hast **diligently** sought me," and to the brother of Jared, "Blessed art thou because **this long time** thou hast **diligently** sought me." And Nephi says: "The Lord did **soften my heart** so that I did not rebel against my father like my brethren (Laman and Lemuel), but I did believe all the words of my father." They could not see the wickedness of the Jews, So it is with us. We will not be able to see the wickedness of the nations today except we **diligently** seek the Lord and He **softens our hearts** and **quickens our minds**, gives us faith and repentance, as He did Nephi. Faith and repentance are both a gift from God and is only given to those who **diligently** seek it. The Lamanite King said, "But I also thank my God, yea my great God, that He hath granted unto us that we might repent of these things * * * for it was all we could do to **repent sufficiently**." Alma 24:10, 11.

Now, to go back to our subject. President Grant says this rule of the unions to strike when a non-union man is employed is in direct opposition to the laws of God," and compares it to the battle fought in heaven with Satan, for free agency, etc. But these men will contend they are standing for free agency in the right to strike and quit work when they please. No doubt the right to strike is often abused, and misused, but to deny that right is slavery—worse than black slavery, for the slave owners did care for the old and crippled slaves, but the trusts and corporations, as a rule, will not care for the aged and infirm, but turn them off to starve and die. Both sides are selfish and looking to their own interests, and it is almost impossible to side with either without making matters worse rather than better.

These union men strike when a nonunion man is employed for the same reason that trusts and corporations boycott and crush small competitors in order to control prices.

When the courts declare strikes unlawful, it tends to drive unions closer together, until they all unite and strike at once to **show** capitalists if they have not a right to strike. The Lord is "turning them to the hardness of their hearts and blindness of their minds even to bringing them down into captivity and destruction both temporally and spiritually according to the captivity of the devil." (1 Nephi 14:7.) The Lord is "withholding His spirit from the inhabitants of the earth," and "Satan goeth to deceive the nations." When men resist the good spirit of love and devotion, God withdraws his spirit—the warm, positive, active spirit for good, and the negative, passive spirit of evil takes its place, resulting in destruction; just as the withdrawal of active heat results in negative cold, and results in freezing and bursting of pipes—death and destruction, anarchy, chaos.

We are constantly drilled and disciplined to follow our file leaders, and with reservations it is a good principle. Every kite, however, should have a string to it, in fact will not work without one. Paul says, "Follow

me as I follow Christ," but what if our leaders follow Taft and Wilson—must we still follow? Is Taft and Wilson and Lloyd George and Clemenceau following Christ? If so, why should they be between us and Christ? Are they not in our way, obscuring the light and confusing it? At one time we followed Roosevelt, but when he and Taft clashed and separated, we followed Taft and rejected Roosevelt as disloyal and traitorous, splitting his party. Now we are inclined to garnish his sepulchre and stone his Americanism.

Our file leader, Wilson, feeds us on oratorical platitudes such as "open covenants openly made" and "self-determination of peoples" and then proceeds to frame up the League of Nations behind closed doors, in star chamber fashion, without consulting leading Republicans, and then demands their acceptance without debate or reservations.

And what about his "self-determination of peoples" in the case of Fiume in Italy, Home rule for bull-ridden Ireland, and the Chinese province of Shantung turned over to Japan? What can these people think of this pet doctrine of the "self-determinations of peoples?" How can our leaders expect us to demurely follow such questionable second-hand leadership without hesitation or reservation? The Lord says in the preface section of the Doctrine and Covenants, "the weak things of the world shall come and break down the mighty and strong ones that man should not counsel his fellowman, neither trust in the arm of flesh, but that every man might speak in the name of God the Lord, even the Savior of the world?"

"I want to say to you that there never was a time since the organization of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, when a man led the Church, not for one moment. It was not so in the days of Joseph; it was not so in the days of Brigham Young; it has not been so since; it never will be so. The direction of this work among the people of the world will never be left to man. It is God's work, let me tell you, and I hope you will put it down in your memoranda, and do not forget that it is the Almighty that is going to do this work, and consummate it, and not man. No man shall have the honor

of doing it, nor has any man ever had the power to do it of himself. It is God's work. If it had been the work of man we would have been like the rest of the world, and it would not have been true of us that God has chosen us out of the world, but we would be a part of it, and "hail fellow, well met," with it; but it is true that God has chosen us out of the world; therefore we are not of it; therefore they hate us and they will fight us and say all manner of evil against us falsely, as they have ever done from the beginning. And they will continue to seek the destruction of the Latter-day Saints, and to feel towards us in the future, as they have felt in the past. Now don't you forget it my brothers and sisters. (Joseph F. Smith, Gospel Doc., page 93.)

We believe the judgments in store for this nation will so far exceed the late judgments on Europe as did the judgments on this hemisphere at the crucifixion exceed the judgments on the Eastern hemisphere at that period, for "this is a choice land above all other lands" and God has irrevocably decreed that "the people that inhabit this land shall serve Me—or they shall perish." (Ether 2:5-12.)

Now this nation is not serving God, but they are serving Mammon or Satan—the God of this world. They are accurately described in 3 Nephi 16:10 by Jesus Christ and thus commandeth the Father that I should say unto you "at that day when the Gentiles shall sin against My gospel and shall be lifted up in the pride of their hearts above all nations and above all peoples of the whole earth and shall be filled with all manner of lyings and of deceits and of mischiefs and all manner of hypocrisy and murder and priestcraft and whoredoms and secret abominations." Now we all know that is a true indictment. We know they have sinned against the gospel by rejecting it, and mobbing and plundering and murdering the Saints, and when the prophet Joseph Smith appealed to the governors and judges and even the President of the United States, his answer was: "Your cause is just, but I can do nothing for you." The results of the late war have lifted them in the pride of their hearts above

all nations of the whole earth, and their cup of iniquity is almost full. "The time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation" is near at hand. "Behold the sword of vengeance hangeth over you and the time soon cometh that he avengeth the blood of the saints upon you, for He will not suffer their cries any longer." (Mormon 9-41.) The railroad trouble is being postponed, awaiting the fulness of the Gentiles, when "I will destroy thy chariots" and "cut off the cities of thy land and throw down all thy strongholds * * * and execute vengeance and fury upon them even as upon the heathens such as they have not heard." (3 Nephi, 21.) "They are turning to the hardness of their hearts and blindness of their minds even unto bringing them down unto destruction both temporally and spiritually according to the captivity of the devil." (1 Nephi 14-7.)

At the October Conference of 1918 President Penrose said that President Woodruff held the keys, and that he turned the key by the Manifesto and after that all plural marriages were null and void. President Smith endorsed all President Penrose had said without reservation, and President Grant followed with the same endorsement, as shown by the Conference reports of that date, and ridiculed the claim of inspiration by those entering plural marriage since the Manifesto with the "nigger" story—a story of a negro praying the Lord to send him turkey but the turkey not coming he decided "dis nigger didn't know how to pray" so improved on his prayer by asking the Lord to send "dis nigger where the turkey was," and the next day dis nigger had turkey.

Now, the plain inference is that the men taking plural wives since the Manifesto obtained them just as this nigger obtained his turkey. Now, this is the same accusation brought against John Taylor, Brigham Young and Joseph Smith, even to his first wife, Emma. They all claimed to have taken their wives by inspiration and revelation, but their enemies ridiculed the idea. Mr. Bierbower appealed to the jury to convict Apostle Lorenzo Snow, assuring them it would result in a new revelation, annulling plural marriage, but Apostle Snow

assured them that whatever reputation Mr. Bierbower might have attained as a lawyer, he certainly would fail as a prophet, for God never would change His law on marriage.

Now, the all important question is "Who is the true prophet, Bierbower or Lorenzo Snow? To attempt denaturing the Manifesto and diluting it from revelation to inspiration is splitting hairs. The Manifesto is either from God or is not from God. There is no half way about it. There can be no question but that God permitted it as He permitted Martin Harris to have the 116 pages of Book of Mormon manuscript, and permitted Israel to have a king; but the pertinent question is, which was the true prophet, Bierbower or President Snow?

We are hurt and wounded when our enemies ridicule plural marriage and insinuate that it is not from God, but is based on lust, that the revelations of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young and John Taylor, and many others to take plural wives was comparable to the nigger's prayer for turkey, but when it comes from our friends and brethren it is "the unkindest cut of all."

It may be all very nice and easy to drift with the tide of popularity along the lines of least resistance, and make merry of others' prayers and revelations, but the time is near at hand when merry-making will be turned to mourning, and both men and women "will pray both night and day until deliverance comes," and "it shall be a vexation to hear the reports," for "how much she hath glorified herself so much sorrow and torment give her for she sayeth in her heart I sit a queen and am no widow and shall see no sorrow. Therefore, shall her plagues come in one day—death and mourning and famine." Let us so live that we may not shrink with shame when every man is known for what he is, and the secret motives of the heart are proclaimed from the house-tops, "for the judgments of God are always just, but the judgments of men are not always just." (Mosiah 29; 12.)

There is a sin called self, which binds the world
In fetters fell, than all save truth more strong;
A sin most serpentine, 'round all men curled,
And in its fold earth writhes full long.
Crime's great first cause, the primal root of wrong,
Parent of pride and tree of tyranny.
To lay the axe doth unto thee belong.
Strike, that the world may know of liberty,
And Zion's land indeed a land of Zion be!

—From O. F. Whitney's poem, "Elias."

For the benefit of those calling for a progressive and constructive criticism we will quote from a letter to President Smith under date of May 6, 1914:

"I seem to need more succor and help in a religious and faith promoting way since coming home than while on my mission. My experience is that one needs more help from the Lord to missionary among the people at home than among the people of the world. Our own people are more for pleasure than the church people of the world, and just as much for fashion. They are also patterning after Babylon in their family affairs, curtailing unnaturally the number of children, etc., and as to polygamy I would rather preach it to the world and can do so with less opposition than among our own people. I believe the principle is of necessity suspended, and should be so regarded, but I think we should believe in it just as much as ever. If the belief is wrong, then Mormonism is wrong and we are wasting our time and means preaching it to the world.

Neither do I approve of the way in which the financial institutions of Zion are managed. The Lord says in the Doc. and Cov. that if we are not equal in earthly things we cannot be equal in heavenly things; that Zion cannot be built up except on the principles of righteousness, and yet in the face of these plain teachings Zion's Savings Bank gives 4 per cent of their large profits to the poor depositors—the large dividends going to the well to do stockholders, thus going to private fortunes instead of helping build up Zion. The name Zion and

Presidency of the Church are used as an asset for the benefit of these private stockholders.

As the law of Moses was given to the Jews as a school-master, so is the law of tithing given to us as a school-master, to bring us to the law of consecration or the law order of Enoch, but the principles upon which Zion's Savings Bank is run leads us **from** and not **towards** the Lord.

These sentiments may be a little strong for this letter, but it expresses my private feelings. I believe that a more equitable division of the profits as between depositors and stockholders would tend Zionward, and that after the depositors and stockholders had received a fair return on their money the balance should go to the church for the use of the name Zion, and the presidency of the Church. The prestige of these names tends to increase the earnings of the bank, but as I view it rightfully belongs to the church. The money end of it don't amount to so much as the example—not only to the saints but also to the world. I think we should let our light so shine that the world would see it and give glory to God. The judgments are coming upon the world because of wrongs, and oppression and sin, no small part of which is the unfair division of wealth and profits of labor as between rich and poor. Zion ought to lead in this, and prohibition, and many other good things, as in women suffrage, education, etc.

To show I am in earnest I will agree to take stock in Zion's institutions if they are remodeled so as to lead toward the law of consecration.

Now, President Smith, I hope you won't think me a crank or meddling in things that are none of my business. I assure you my whole heart is in this gospel and for the Kingdom of God, and I want to be one with my brethren and support our leaders. But it seems the more I pray and the harder I try to get near to the Lord the stronger I feel these things. What am I to do?"

We received no written answer to this letter, but at the first chance he put his arms around me and said "kind words of the heart."

We find many married men who would be pleased to go on missions if they had the necessary means for

the support of their families during their absence, and many more who might go but for the rule that missionaries must be free from debt. Presidents of Stakes and Bishops of Wards have complained of this rule, and suggested that many men in debt were nevertheless better qualified financially to go on missions than those out of debt, for nearly all well to do men are in debt, speculating in their business, while many of those out of debt is because they are too poor to have credit.

President Smith defended this rule, however, because when men went on missions owing institutions over which he presided, they got after the missionaries for debts and made it unpleasant for him as standing between the two. Now, we maintain these institutions making big dividends out of the name of Zion and the Presidency of the Church should help these missionaries and their families instead of suing them. Let's hear what the Lord says about it: "Behold I say unto you that it is the duty of the church to assist in supporting the families of those, and also to support the families of those who are called and must needs be sent into the world to proclaim the gospel to the world." Doc. and Cov., Sec. 75:24.)

Now if the first ten per cent of Zion's Savings Bank was divided 4 per cent to the depositors and 6 per cent to the stockholders and all in excess of that amount divided equally between them and the church through whose prestige they obtain it, it would tend to a more equitable division of profits and the church portion could be used to assist these poor families while their husbands and fathers were on missions. If all the institutions using the Presidency of the Church for prestige and profit would do this there would be ample funds for married and experienced missionaries—much needed among the young boys now monopolizing the whole field on account of the lack of means among older brethren, or the rule to be out of debt. It would mean if Zion Savings Bank made 14 per cent stockholders would get 7 per cent, depositors 5 per cent and the Church 2 per cent. If 18 per cent, stockholders 8 per cent, depositors 6 per cent and the Church 4 per cent. This would tend Zionward and be an example to all the world, but, object these stock-

holders, why should not stockmen and farmers do likewise? We answer, they should if they so used the prestige of the Church.

We do not presume to put this forth as revelation or dictation to the Church, but merely as constructive, progressive criticism.

We do not believe the majority of the Latter-day Saints approve of the exploiting of the Church prestige and finance for the amassing of private fortunes. There is a credit and increment of values rightfully belonging to the Church. We do not believe a majority of the Latter-day Saints believe it proper and seeming to put millions of Church funds into a hotel to harbor a bar under its roof. The rank and file of the Mormon people indicated their attitude on this question when they kicked the saloons out of every town and hamlet throughout Mormondom, in the face of increased taxes and smuggling boot-leggers from contiguous Gentile cities, and yet the accursed thing defiantly barricaded itself in the Church Hotel Utah, until kicked out by the State. By all the known rules of reason and logic, biologic, theologic, geologic, sociologic and psychological calculations, Utah should have led this nation in prohibition. Why it did not only the inside few know to this day.

We do not think it right that Church funds should be invested in apartment houses that exclude families with children. The bible says "children are an heritage from the Lord, and blessed is he who hath his quiver full of them."

Our Church schools are patterned too much after Babylon in that the physical and mental training tends altogether too much to the development of sports and dudes, rather than farmers and artisans—the productive pursuits of life. Like mobs and Indian tribes they must have college spirit and a college yell, all out of harmony with the quiet peaceful spirit of the gospel they are supposed to study. Next thing we will be employing Jack Dempsey for coach and a Commanche Chief for yell-master.

We orate about the peace of nations and in the next breath advocate compulsory military training, like a treacherous hypocrite shaking hands with a knife up his sleeve. A better curriculum would be compulsory agricultural training to reduce the high cost of living and avert the starving mob-law that hangs heavily over our heads. As it is our schools are producing mostly salesmen, drummers, agents and beaurocrats as parasites on the body politic increasing the high cost of living.

The allies under the leadership of France and England have insisted that this late war was a contest between democracy and autocracy and our own leaders caught up the popular refrain and carried it still farther, comparing it to the war in heaven between Christ and Satan, or rather Michael and his angels fighting Satan and his angels for free agency.

Now we protest against any such a comparison as being contrary to scripture, reason and truth. The prophet Nephi says all the nations of both Jew and Gentile, those upon this land and those upon other lands, even upon all the lands of the earth shall be drunken in iniquity, and all manner of abominations. (IINephi 27:1). And Jesus Christ said to the Nephites upon this continent, woe be unto the Gentiles except they repent, for it shall come to pass that the sword of My justice shall hang over them at that day, and except they repent it shall fall upon them sayeth the Father, even upon all nations of the Gentiles. (III Nephi 20:20).

The Doc. & Cov., Pearl of Great Price and Bible are replete with scripture equally plain and emphatic, too numerous to mention. Now the fact is that the Kaiser and Czar were equally autocratic and plutocratic; that the clash between Germany and Russia was like the combinations of the upper and lower jaws of the hyena; that the conflict between Germany and France was comparable with the axe and the chopping block, and France better versed in its use than Germany, as attested in the St. Bartholomew massacre, and the French revolution. Just one century before France under Napoleon was trying to

do the same thing to Europe that Germany tried in this war.

England in her time has been just as aggressive and greedy and dictatorial as Germany. She fought us in 1776 and again in 1812 and would have fought us again in 1862 for the very opposite principle she fought us in 1812; (the right to search vessels on the high seas) had not Lincoln been more consistent and drawn attention to the anomalous incongruity of the two nations going to war on opposite sides of the former controversy. The incident of difference arose through the taking of the southern commissioners, Mason and Slidell, from the British vessel Trent by Capt. Wilkes. We regard the incident as providentially designed to draw specific attention to the prophecy of Joseph Smith in Sec. 87 that the southern states should call on Great Britain and then she would call on other nations, as in this late war, etc. As it was, she helped the South so much that she was obliged to pay \$15,000,000 indemnity after the war. She also sympathized with Germany and sided with her as against the United States in our Venezuela differences in 1902 under the Roosevelt administration. Her whole history of rule and conquest has been almost a parallel of Roman conquest. The record of her royal families is a history of intrigue, perfidy, and fratricidal war, a continued line of blood and conquest. True, thanks to the rank and file of her common people, she has been disciplined and reformed, but she still, John Bull like, stubbornly holds to her supremacy of the sea, while insisting on Germany's disarmament, and with her turn turtle reversal of 1862 as against 1812, what may we expect when self interest is the stake? In the light of the past can we safely trust ourselves to her tender mercy for the future? "Safety First."

Can we again trust ourselves to the leadership of Taft? We followed him once as the Star of Bethlehem and see where he led us. He sacrificed principle to please everybody and pleased nobody but Utah and Vermont; cried Good Lord and Good Devil, toadied to the dries, and yet vetoed the bill prohibiting wet states shipping intoxicants into dry states.

President Wilson's record is but little better. He

got re-elected because he kept us out of war, and then straightway plunged us into war, disdainfully rejecting the proposition of the pacifist to submit it to a vote of the people; denouncing the Kaiser as a tyrant forcing his people to war, and yet conscripting and forcing our own boys to war regardless of their wishes and denouncing such pacifists as Bryan and David Starr Jordan as cowards and traitors. He opposed woman suffrage in one breath and favors it in the next, guessing at the popular breeze. As to his vetoing the prohibition bill, let him and his followers choose either end of the dilemma, principle or policy. In either case are we safe to follow his lead?

The allied nations in their leading journals denounce the Kaiser as a "second Joshua." How can we reconcile this comparison with the idea of the war symbolizing Michael and his angels fighting Satan and his angels in heaven for free agency? Would to God we Latter-day Saints might be called a "second Daniel," boldly proclaiming the kingdom of heaven is at hand, and the destruction of all these wicked warring nations "as the chaff of the summer threshing floor."

"For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways; and my thoughts than your thoughts."—Isaiah 55:9.

We do not believe that Latter-day Saints will always be so proud of the large sums of money invested in Liberty Bonds as they are today. None of the belligerents in any war were ever able to write a fair and impartial history of that war; in fact were not supposed to. Even neutrals are hardly able to do so at short range. There must be a lapse of time to clear up the blood and dust and smoke of the battle field before anybody can see clearly; especially in the late world war have the sectional lines of hate, selfishness and ambition crossed each other in such a tangled web that God only is able to unravel it and give a fair and truthful history. In fact he has already written it in his scriptures, for prophecy is but

history reversed, recorded in advance. Who is so well qualified to judge of a quarrel among children as the father. Whose decision can be more dependable and final?

The Lord says, "and the blood of that great and abominable church which is the whore of all earth shall be upon their own heads for they shall war among themselves and the sword of their own hands shall fall upon their own heads and they shall be drunken with their own blood." (I Nephi 22:13.)

The true line of battle is not between allied and central powers, but between the kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this world as shown in Daniel second chapter. The stone is to strike the image upon its feet and toes, and destroy all of them, big and little, central and allied. He is to "rise up as in the valley of Gideon" where the enemy destroyed each other. These wicked nations are to call on each other for help and "suffer the wrath and indignation of Almighty God, until the consummation decreed that made a full end of all nations." (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 87).

There is no evidence that God is on either side of this terrible conflict, but every evidence that he is simply bumping their heads together. They are all about equally wicked as measured by the Ten Commandments, God's measuring rod. None of us can say that our skirts are clear and that we are in no way to blame for the war.

Like a bunch of scrapping boys we each insist that "he hit first." True we hit last but we have been very provoking. While we claimed to be neutral we were furnishing money and food and war munitions to one side of the belligerents. Our own words condemn us. On the 2nd of April, 1917, President Wilson said to the special war congress "We live in an age when it will be insisted that the same standard of wrong done shall be acknowledged between nations as between individuals, citizens of a civilized state."

Now individual citizens of a civilized state would not sell fire arms to their quarreling neighbors with which to kill each other, much less carry them over a public highway to them, as we were doing in the case of England and France. An "individual citizen of a civilized

state" doing such a thing would be accounted as bad as the combatant, in fact accessory to the crime. In the beginning Germany protested against our selling to her enemies, but we defended, that it was no fault of ours that Germany could not come to buy also. However, when England and France failed to come over to us and buy we carried the arms right over to them, and thus provoked Germany to sink our vessels, and then we go to war about it.

President Wilson further said, "We have no quarrel with the German people. Our quarrel is with their rulers who force their people to war as in the old unhappy days when rulers made war without consulting their people." And yet our rulers made war on Germany without consulting the people and conscripted and forced our boys to fight or go to jail, just as Germany did.

We re-elected President Wilson because he kept us out of war, and our congress was elected on a peace platform, but the president turned down the proposition of the pacifist to submit the proposition of war to a vote of the people. Such men as Bryan and David Starr Jordan were denounced as cowards and traitors, unworthy of American citizenship.

The Lord has commanded his Saints to "renounce war and proclaim peace." (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 98:16). And again, "this is the law that I gave unto mine ancient saints that they should not go out into battle against any nation, kindred, tongue or people save I the Lord commanded them, and if any nation, tongue or people should proclaim war against them they should first lift up the standard of peace unto that people, nation or tongue and if that people did not accept that offering of peace, neither the second nor the third time, they should bring these testimonies before the Lord." (verses 33, 34, 35).

Oh but it is protested, we have borne with Germany's outrages until patience ceased to be a virtue. True Germany was cruel and relentless, but her patience was also tried with our pretended neutrality while feeding and arming her enemies. Let us put ourselves in Germany's place and what would we have done? In the civil war we blockaded our enemy's ports, and allowed no traffic with them by sea or land, and later fined England

\$15,000,000 indemnity for violating the rules of neutrality in the case of the Alabama fitted out in her port. Does it make a difference whose ox is gored?

Germany run up the white flag and sent out the dove of peace several times during the war but she brought back no olive leaf. At one time President Wilson sent a note to the allies in the name of humanity, asking for a reply to Germany's appeal for peace, but when they were reluctantly given they were so severe that President Wilson could not recommend Germany's acceptance. Even the Deseret News in an editorial censured the Allies as stubborn and inconsiderate, comparing the case to a wrestling match in which one party is willing to quit but the other stubbornly persists in continuing the contest to the annoyance of bystanders whose toes are being trampled.

As a neutral President Wilson insisted that in the peace negotiations there should be no concessions of territory, no aggressions, no indemnities, etc. and talked of "open covenants openly made" and "the self-determination of the people." But somehow these platitudes did not materialize.

We talk about righting the wrongs of 1871, and turning back Alsace and Lorraine, but why not go still further back while we are about it and right the wrong when France took these same provinces from Germany and much more, some 200 years previous. How is it we never heard anything of these wrongs of 1871 until we got into this war? Spain requested that Prince Leopold of German kinship occupy their vacant throne, but France sent a protest to Germany. The answer might have been that it was none of their business, but Germany deferentially conceded their request, when France demanded that Germany further pledge herself to never think of such a thing in the future under any circumstances, upon which Germany stood on her dignity and refused to make any such promise; whereupon France like a petulant child declared war and sent an invading army into Germany. She got whipped and Alsace and Lorraine went back to Germany where they formerly belonged. Now where was the great wrong? Our school histories

tell us "German demands were not over-severe under the circumstances."

Oh, but they say Bismarck cunningly provoked France into declaring war. Was it any more adroitly conceived than our war with Mexico in 1846? of which Lincoln said: "It was as unjust a war as ever a strong nation waged against a weak one." Suppose some allied nations should combine and force us to right the wrong of 1846 against Mexico.

Now as a state we were obliged to send men and money to fight this great war, right or wrong, or be in rebellion; but not as a Church. There was no more propriety in our sending tithing money to help kill German Saints than for German Saints to put up their tithing money to help kill American Saints. The commandment to obey the laws of the land is just as binding upon the German Saints as upon American Saints. Is God's kingdom divided against itself?

It is very popular just now to denounce the Germans and very unpopular to say anything in their defense. But is it wicked to sympathize with the under dog. We do not believe the Germans as bad as they are represented to be or they would not have maintained so good a government among themselves as they have for these many years. Think of 65,000,000 huddled in a space about the size of our one lone star state, and then think of the order and prosperity and education and all the sciences and fine arts leading the world as with a beacon light.

Our severest criticism is that the German people have been too submissive and obedient to their leaders and yet we hear much of the necessity of unity and obedience and submission to our leaders. Oh, but it will be insisted our leaders are good while their leaders were bad. Well, who is to be the judge? They seem to be pretty well satisfied with their leaders, about as well as we are with ours, and about as united.

Oh, but it is contended they started the war, but each combatant says the other started it. Austria said Serbia started it, and Serbia says Austria started it, and Germany says Russia started it. True, Germany did strike the first blow. But like a bunch of drunken men they were all jerking their coats and tearing their shirts. Germany

knew that if she throttled Russia who was making war on her ally, Austria, that France would be on her back. She only struck Belgium because she stood between her and her old enemy France and would not let her pass peaceably. Oh, but it is protested, France was not ready and had to have help. Ready or not, she was ready to stop the greatest fighting machine the world has ever seen within a few miles of Paris. The fact is, France had been watching this opportunity for revenge the past forty years and as the Lord says in Book of Doc. & Cov. Sec. 87, the nations should call on each other for help until war should be declared upon all nations, and "the inhabitants of the earth should mourn and suffer the wrath and indignation of Almighty God, until the consummation decreed made a full end of all nations." All these nations are wicked as measured by God's rule—the Ten Commandments, and we as Latter-day Saints should not side with either of them any farther than we are obliged to. True Germany was desperate and cruel, but so were both North and South in the civil war, and when the South protested that Sherman was violating every rule of international law in his march to the seas without a commissary, his famous answer was: "Don't you know war is hell?" Grant was cruel and relentless also in his anxiety to end the war, and would not have allowed anybody to have carried food and war munitions to the enemy under any circumstances. Imagine Grant allowing anybody carrying food or arms into Ft. Donaldson or Vicksburg, either by land or water or air, if he could stop them, even though they carried women and children.

When the civil war was over Lincoln did not demand the surrender and trial of Jefferson Davis and southern leaders as the Allies are demanding the Kaiser and German leaders. But his humane policy was to let them alone or give them a chance to escape. If the South had won the war we would not have appreciated the idea of putting Lincoln and Grant and Sherman on trial, nor if England had won the war against the colonies would be approve of putting Washington, Jefferson and Franklin on trial. Are we observing our own rules to do unto others as we would wish to be done by. Germany did not so treat France in 1871. She did not extradite the French leaders.

The law of self-preservation is the first law of life, but there is a possibility of carrying it to extreme, even to the violation of our boasted liberty of conscience and freedom of speech and the press. Shall we ignore the very principles for which we claim to have fought Germany? Do we think to abolish anarchy by fighting Socialism? We are making anarchists of Socialists when we imprison such men as Debbs and exclude Socialist representatives from our legislative halls, as in congress and the New York legislature we are brewing our own troubles. With our conglomerate heterogeneous citizenship we are in the most dangerous condition of any nation on earth. We represent the extreme end of the toes of the great image, composed of pig iron and miry clay. "And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men, but they shall not cleave one to another even as iron is not mixed with clay." Daniel. And further we occupy "a land that is choice above all other lands, and the people that inhabit this land shall serve me or they shall perish." Ether 2 ch.

The United Order is the only remedy for the present ills of this nation, and yet if the Latter-day Saints should preach or attempt to practice it they would be denounced and deported as Reds. They are "turned to the hardness of their hearts and the blindness of their minds even unto bringing them down unto destruction both temporal and spiritual according to the captivity of the devil." (I Nephi 14:7).

We respectfully invite the readers to compare the incident and merit of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 and the United States-Mexican War of 1846, and pass judgment from the exalted standpoint of Abraham Lincoln, as set forth in his congressional speeches. And still further exercise in Christian breadth of view, by striving to see the late world war in the same light that Lincoln saw the civil war, a judgment of God upon both north and south, as set forth in his world famous second inaugural. We ask comparison of his humane attitude to the south and her leaders, with the severe attitude of the allies to Germany and her leaders.

"Judge not that ye be not judged." But comparison is not necessarily a verdict. "With charity to all and malice to none, with firmness for the right, let us press on to our duty as God gives us the light to see it."

THE WRONG OF 1871?

"The Battle of Sedan," quotation from "The Great Events by Famous Historians," Vol. 18, page 302:

"One of the most noteworthy victories of modern times was that won at Sedan by the German army, under King William I of Prussia, over the French, commanded by Napoleon III and his generals, MacMahon and Wimpffen. This event led to the fall of the French Empire and the establishment of the Third Republic. It also marked the culmination of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871. While the immediate ostensible cause of the war was the nomination by the Cortes of Prince Leopold, who was related to the Hohenzollerns, as successor to the Spanish throne, the underlying causes were of much greater import. After her triumph over Austria in 1866, Prussia rose to great prominence, and soon she appeared to be supplanting France as the leading State of Continental Europe. Napoleon III wished to add to his territory on the Rhine, but Prussia refused to cede the coveted lands. She also thwarted his attempt to purchase Luxemburg from Holland.

"After these rebuffs the Emperor only awaited some pretext for war, although France had seldom been so poorly prepared. He eagerly seized upon the choice of Leopold for Spain, objecting on the ground of that Prince's relationship to the royal house of Prussia. Napoleon obtained from King William the withdrawal of Prussia's consent to Leopold's candidacy, but when the Emperor demanded also of the King a promise that never, in any circumstances, should Leopold accept the Spanish crown, William declined to make such an agreement. Napoleon regarded this refusal as a valid excuse for war. But Prussia was equally desirous of a conflict, and the statecraft of Bismarck took the form of subtle intrigue that made the rupture inevitable."

Now we invite comparison of the statecraft and subtle intrigue of Bismarck with the statecraft and subtle intrigue of Presidents Van Buren and Polk, with their cabinets, in provoking the Mexican war.

We have never understood until recently that Bismarck was such a bad man. From the same volume, at page 314, we quote from a private letter to his wife, but intercepted by French soldiers and published in French newspapers:

"Count Otto Von Bismarck
"Vendresse, September 3, 1870."

"My Dear Heart:

"I left my present quarters before early dawn the day before yesterday, came back today, and have in the mean time witnessed the great battle of Sedan, in which we made about thirty thousand prisoners, and threw the remainder of the French army, which we have been pursuing since we were at Bar-le-Duc, into the fortress, where they had to surrender themselves, along with the Emperor, prisoners of war. Yesterday morning at five o'clock, after I had been negotiating until 1 a. m. with Moltke and the French generals about the capitulation to be conducted, I was awakened by General Reille, with whom I am acquainted, to tell me that Napoleon wished to speak with me.

"Unwashed and unbreakfasted, I rode toward Sedan, found the Emperor in an open carriage, with three aides-de-camp and three in attendance on horseback, halted on the road before Sedan. I dismounted, saluted him just as politely as at the Tuileries, and asked for his commands. He wished to see the King; I told him, as the truth was, that his Majesty had his quarters fifteen miles away, at the spot where I am now writing. In answer to Napoleon's questions where he should go to, I offered him, as I was not acquainted with the country, my own quarters at Donchery, a small place in the neighborhood, close by Sedan. He accepted, and drove, accompanied by his six Frenchmen, by me and by Carl (who in the mean time had ridden after me), through the lonely morning toward our lines.

"Before coming to the spot, he began to hesitate on account of the possible crowd, and asked me if he could

alight in a lonely cottage by the wayside. I had it inspected by Carl, who brought word that it was mean and dirty. 'N'importe,' said Napoleon, and I ascended with him a rickety narrow staircase. In an apartment of ten feet square, with a deal table and two rush-bottomed chairs, we sat for an hour; the others were below—a powerful contrast with our last meeting in the Tuileries in 1867. Our conversation was a difficult thing, if I wished to avoid touching on topics which could not but affect painfully the man whom God's mighty hand had cast down.

"I had sent Carl to fetch officers from the town and to beg Moltke to come. We then sent one of the former to reconnoitre, and discovered, twenty-one and a half miles distant in Frenois, a chateau situated in a park. Thither I accompanied him with an escort of the Cuirassier Regiment of Life-Guards, which had meantime been brought up, and there we concluded with the French General-in-Chief, Wimpffen, the capitulation, by virtue of which from forty thousand to sixty thousand Frenchmen—I do not know accurately, at present—with all they possess, became our prisoners. Yesterday and the day before cost France one hundred thousand men and an emperor. This morning the latter, with all his suite, horses and carriages, started for Wilhelmshöhe, near Cassel.

"It is an event of great weight in the world's history, a victory for which we shall humbly thank the Almighty, and which decides the war, even if we have to carry it on against France shorn of her Emperor.

"I must conclude. With heartfelt joy I learned from your and Maria's letters that Herbert has arrived among you. Bill I spoke to yesterday, as already telegraphed, and embraced him from horseback in his Majesty's presence, while he stood motionless in the ranks. He is very healthy and happy. I saw Hans and Fritz Carl, both Buelows, in the Second Dragoon Guards, well and cheerful.

Good-by, my heart; love to the children. Your
V. B."

Private letters, like private prayers, will reveal a man's character almost true as a photograph. It reads almost like a Lincoln letter.

The peaceful triumph of woman suffrage and prohibition by evolution is a sign of better days—the dawn of the Millenium. United Order is the next essential to cure the threatening industrial troubles, but we do not agree with Bellamy in his “Looking Backward” that it will come by peaceful evolution. So precious a thing cannot come into the world without trouble and labor, revolution. Neither political nor religious freedom came to us without blood, neither can industrial freedom come without it. Blood is the fore-runner of every great blessing, temporal and spiritual. Neither do we believe with Bellamy that the United Order or Socialism will function independent of religion. The necessary love of God and one’s fellow man does not come without the spirit of God through the gospel of Jesus Christ.

In the Laws and Ordinances of the State of Deseret of 1851 we find vagrancy defined as “any person who is engaged in no useful employment and has apparently no manner of support” and “Be it further ordained, that any person convicted as aforesaid, shall be compelled to labor on the public works a sufficient length of time to pay the cost of prosecution; provided, the same be not less than twenty days.

“And be it further ordained, that it shall be the duty of every officer of State, in this State, to report to the magistrate of their respective precincts, any person whom they may have good reason to suspect as being a vagrant under this ordinance.

“The foregoing ordinance shall apply to all loafers who hang about the corners of streets, court houses, or any other public place, who have no business, whether they have property or not.”

“JEDEDIAH M. GRANT,

“Speaker of the House of Representatives.

“HEBER C. KIMBALL,

“Speaker of the Senate.

“Approved, Feb. 12, 1851, BRIGHAM YOUNG, Gov.

“THOMAS BULLOCK, Clerk.”

We respectfully recommend the re-enactment of this old law as the surest remedy for the High Cost of Living,

as well as many other evils that haunt us like a nightmare.

Here is another source of revenue to reduce taxes, taken from Laws and Ordinances of 1851: "Be it further ordained, that if any person or persons shall swear, by the name of God, or Jesus Christ, in any manner using their names profanely, shall, for each offence, pay the sum of not less than five dollars, or be imprisoned at the discretion of the court."

Interpersed as these writings have necessarily been with the toils and cares of ranch and farm life, some repetition naturally has occurred, for which we were about to apologize; but who would apologize for these repetitions in the Scriptures? All given within a few months.

"Search diligently, pray always, and be believing, and all things shall work together for your good, if ye walk uprightly and remember the covenant wherewith ye have covenanted one with another."—Sec. 90:24, Doc. & Cov.

"Therefore he giveth this promise unto you, with an immutable covenant that they shall be fulfilled, and all things wherewith you have been afflicted, shall work together for your good, and to my name's glory, saith the Lord."—Sec. 98:3, Doc. & Cov.

"Therefore let your hearts be comforted, for all things shall work together for good to them that walk uprightly, and to the sanctification of the church;

"For I will raise up unto myself a pure people, that will serve me in righteousness;"—Sec. 100:15-16, Doc. & Cov.

"With charity for all and malice to none, with firmness for the right, let us press on to our duty as God gives us the light to see it."

We do well to put the above in quotation, for it is not in the hearts of our countrymen today.

A few years since the vision of Washington was published in journals and newspapers and scattered

broadcast over the land. We have recently been making a great deal to do over Lincoln and Washington celebrations, but the true and distinguishing sentiments of these illustrious leaders seem to "pass by us as the idle wind which we respect not," except Washington's warning against "entangling alliances," and that only in a partisan spirit of which he also cautions us.

Now, would it not be a nice and safe precaution for us to pause in our mad career and make some observations as to our latitude and longitude with reference to the precepts and principles of these great luminaries? Where are we at, and whither are we drifting, and where are we likely to land? Compare the party spirit of Washington with the present party spirit. His party spirit subordinated to patriotism is almost pathetic in his clinging to Jefferson with one hand and Hamilton with the other—the two extremes of our national polity and yet the best talent and most valuable assets of the nation, declining their resignations and pleading with each to be reconciled to each other, allay party spirit and devote their transcendent abilities to the service of their country.

Take note of Lincoln's appointing to his cabinet his severe critics, schooling his private feelings to the one inspiration of his life, to save the Union. What was the little petty personal animosities of these otherwise splendid men to him compared with the welfare of the Union? He would make any personal sacrifice of private feelings to serve his country. He would suffer any personal humiliation to obtain and retain that talent and martial every element of reconciliation for the preservation of the Union. Re-election cut no figure with him, just so "the government of the people, by the people, for the people should not perish from the earth."

But how do we frame up with these sentiments today? Observe the partisan spirit tearing into the very vitals of our institutions and like a streak of yellow running through the whole fabric of our Union. Had the spirit of Washington prevailed against entangling alliances, we might have avoided the late war, as he avoided the European wars in which France so insistently sought to involve us, and had our present admin-

istration shunned party spirit as both Washington and Lincoln did, the nation would not now be distracted as it is. Either of these great patriots would have appointed Roosevelt to a prominent position in the war (after participating), and Root and Knox and Lodge would have been invited to participate in the framing of the peace treaty, and Taft would have been appointed to the supreme bench; thus allaying partisanship and forcing unconditional surrender to the united welfare of our common interests. Note the treatment or mis-treatment of Jordan and Bryan, stigmatized as cowards and traitors, unworthy of American citizenship.

In the vision of Washington he plainly saw the three great perils that would come to this country—the war of 1812, the Civil war and the late European war, from which we quote:

“Son of the Republic, the end of a century cometh. Look and learn. The dark shadowed angel then placed a trumpet to his mouth and blew three distinct blasts and taking water from the ocean sprinkled it upon Europe, Asia and Africa. Then my eyes looked upon a fearful scene. From each of those countries arose thick, black clouds which joined into one, and throughout this mass gleamed a dark red light, by which I saw hordes of armed men, who, moving with the cloud, marched by land and sailed by sea to America, which country was presently enveloped in a cloud. As I dimly saw the vast armies devastate the whole country and pillage and burn, and as I saw the countless millions maim and kill, I heard the voice, ‘Son of the Republic, look and learn.’

When the voice ceased, the angel blew a long blast on the trumpet. Instantly a light as from a thousand suns shone down from above me and pierced the dark clouds which enveloped America. At the same moment I saw the angel on whose forehead shone the word UNION, descend, accompanied by a horde of angels who took sides with Americans and routed her foes.”

Evidently the worst is yet to come. The aftermath of industrial wars following in the wake of the European war. The recital of this vision is not verbatim but

from memory after the lapse of many years, and we believe the "hordes of armed men marched by land and sailing by sea to America" are the emigrating hordes of Reds and I. W. W. that now threaten the destruction of our country. For as Lincoln once said, "All the armies of Europe, Asia and Africa combined, with a Croesus purse behind them and a Bonaparte to lead them, could not in a trial of a thousand years make a track over the Blue Ridge or take a drink out of the Ohio. That as a nation of freemen we were doomed to live forever or die by suicide—mob law."

Roosevelt spoke by the same prophetic spirit when he said, "The danger is behind our guns, not in front of them." The same prophetic spirit of Joseph Smith when he saw the saints in the Rocky Mountains—the only people on earth not at war with each other, and the scene so sickening he prayed the Lord to close the vision—the same thing seen by the prophet Daniel when he saw that time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation.

Note the supernatural interposition in Washington's vision of a light from heaven and the interposition of angels in behalf of the Americans, notably absent in the previous wars and doubtless signifying the establishment of the kingdom of God spoken of by Daniel. Here is a combined testimony of prophets—a galaxy unparalleled in prophetic history—Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt, Joseph Smith, Daniel, yes and Isaiah. "Come my people, enter into your chambers (of the Rocky Mountains) as it were for a little moment until the indignation be overpassed, for the Lord cometh out of His place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity, and the earth shall disclose its blood and no more cover its slain." (Isaiah 26:20-21), and Jesus Christ: "I will destroy thy chariots (railroads) and I will cut off the cities of thy land and throw down all thy strongholds . . . And I will pluck up thy groves out of the midst of thee so will I destroy thy cities . . . and I will execute vengeance and fury upon them even

as upon the heathens, such as they have not heard." (3 Nephi, 21 Ch.)

Now, as Latter-day Saints let us avoid these entangling alliances and bitter party spirit. These peace-makers remind us of the fighter jerking his coat and shouting for some one to hold him, and two to hold the other fellow. They want us to fight to keep them from fighting. They are like foolish boys, sicking their dogs of war on porcupines and skunks. Now our trouble is to get rid of the quills and the stink. Can we do it without befouling ourselves or getting hydrophobia and being asphyxiated? These fool boys want some of us to hold their dogs while others hold the skunks and porcupines, and are we foolish enough to try it? We say, let those who want to fight skunks and porcupines fight to their hearts' content; but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.

CONCLUSION

"They were slow to hearken to the voice of the Lord their God, therefore the Lord their God is slow to hearken to their prayers, to answer them in the day of their trouble. In the day of their peace they esteemed lightly my council; but in the day of their trouble of necessity they feel after me." Doc. and Cov., Sec. 107:7, 8.

Now, let us revert to the Introduction of this little booklet, then look about us, and what must be our conclusions? Must it not be that the one ambition and determination of the Latter-day Saints is to be in strict harmony with the world—harmony in dress, in finance, in politics, in social life, in everything. We must go "over the top" in our enthusiasm for war, or for peace, for communism, or against it, for labor, or capital, for plural marriage or against—whichever is the most popular—anything to be "ever in harmony with the world."

We wouldn't even adopt prohibition until it becomes popular. We would not adopt the United Order until it is popular—or we are forced to adopt it to avert mob law. Our hearts are so much set upon the things of the world and the honors of men that we fail to learn this one lesson: That “the love of the world is enmity to God” and that “all those who will live godly in Christ shall suffer persecution.” We are determined at any cost of principle to obtain the things of the world and occupy the topmost seats of the synagogues—everything and anything to be in perfect harmony with Babylon that must fall. The Lord says, “I am withholding my spirit from the inhabitants of the earth,” and Satan goeth forth to deceive the nations, and yet our greatest pride and ambition is to be in perfect harmony with them. Truly, we “sin in that we walk in darkness at noon day.”

The imperative need of the hour is to seek God, morning, noon and night, for **faith** and **repentance**—both priceless gifts from God, granted only to those who seek them diligently. The one is no good without the other. Let us not procrastinate and think He delayeth His coming or He will come like a thief in the night. The century is almost ended since the first vision of the Prophet Joseph; this generation in which the gospel was revealed is almost completed, and we are on the threshold of the greatest eruptions and revolutions the world has ever seen. If we wait until the trouble is on us, the Lord will be slow to hear us. We may think now we don't need the Lord in our prosperity, but in our necessities we will seek Him.

And again; verily, I say unto you, the coming of the Lord draweth nigh and it overtaketh the world as a thief in the night; therefore, gird up your loins that you may be the children of the light, and that day shall not overtake you as a thief. Doc. and Cov., Sec. 106, 3. 5.

It is with controversial mingling of sorrow and satisfaction that we note that nine-tenths of the opposition to Gospel Problems comes from the wealthy and the official. They are usually too proud to accept the unpopular

doctrine of Adam-God, the correct translation of the Book of Mormon, and the doctrine of plural marriage, and they will have none of the United Order. They are well satisfied with things just as they are, and insist they will not come in my day, nor your day; and they sure will not come in my day nor your day if God must wait for them to get ready. Their hearts are so much set on the things of the world, and they aspire to the honors of men, that they fail to learn this one lesson,—that the powers of the priesthood and the powers of heaven are inseparably connected, and the powers of heaven cannot be handled only on the principles of righteousness. (Doc. & Cov., Sec. 21.)

To the proud and selfish this may be sarcastically called a Swan Song, but to those in attune with Zion—the pure in heart, the air, bass and tenor of the whole refrain will be as the siren of “Peace on Earth Good Will to Men.”

We bespeak the charity of the reader for the pardonable indulgence of a thread of native humor that may have inadvertently dropped into the serious warp and woof of this frail fabric. We assure the kind reader that no offence is intended, but only the judicious mingling of light and shade to break the gloom of an ominous sky. But the clouds ye so much dread are big with mercy and will break in blessings on your head;” for the millenium is behind the clouds.



